

SECOND

THE SECOND

OF THE

THE SECOND

THE SECOND

THE SECOND

THE SECOND

THE SECOND

THE SECOND

The more we know of the

THE SECOND

THE SECOND



THAT

THE SECOND

Printed with Philadelphia, 1860.

TO THE READER.

GENTLE Reader, I must needs intreate thy patience to beare with the late edition of this second part: because it is now more then two yeares, since it was giuen to be printed. But, we that cannot haue things done when we will: must be content to take them when we may. And to tell thee the truth, some part of this being penned; was also by mischance lost; which is now repayed. Take it (I pray thee) simple as it is, in good part: and accept of his good will, that wisheth it much better, that it might giue thee the greater satisfaction.

Facsimile.



THE PREFACE.

CHRISTIAN READER, I suppose it shall please thee better, if I do enterayne thy studious minde with some serious discourse, then if I went about to court it, with the ordinary complements of a curious preamble. Wherefore I purpose (by thy gentle patience) to handle here a matter of inuicellous great importance, which M. PER. towards the latter end of his booke, layeth out against vs in manner of a most grievous complaint: it is, that we Catholikes, among many other capitall crimes by vs (as he saileth) defended, doe bolster and uphold the most heinous sinne of Atheisme. The man is not a litle troubled to denie wherein we doe maintayne any such point of impiety: For compelled by the cleare euidence of truth, he confessed that we doe rightly acknowledge the vniuersity of the God-head in the Trinity of persons: yet that he may seeme to say something therein against vs, he flyeth vnto the shred-dure ragges of their common slanders of mans merites and satisfactions, and such old stufes and stretchings them on the tenter-bookes, yet one nayle further then his fellows. Striuer to drive out of them a certayne strange kinde of Atheisme, in this manner: The Roman religion makes the merite of the workes of man, to concur with the grace of God, therefore it overthrowes the grace of God. Item, they acknowledge the infinite justice and mercy of God, but by consequence both are denyed: for how can that be infinite justice, which may any way be appeased by humane satisfaction? And howe shall Gods mercy be infinite, when we by our owne satisfactions must adde a supply to the satisfaction of Christ? There needes a pretty witte (I weene) to vnderstand by what these points appertayne to Atheisme. For suppose that we defended, that the merite of the workes of man concurred with Gods grace, as two distinct agents, which we doe not, for we hold that no workes of man haue any merite, vntill they spring and procede from the very grace of God: but let that be granted, what kinde of Atheisme or denying of God were this? or howe followeth it thereof, that the grace of God (which is the principall agent, and farre more potent then the other) must thereby needes be cast to the ground and foyled? this is so silly and simple, that I knowe not what to reuerie it: for he doth vtterly slander our doctrine, and that to no end and purpose. To his second canill I answer in a word.

THE PREFACE.

that we teach (as he knoweth right well) the infinite justice of Gods to be appeased no other way, then by the infinite satisfaction of Christs passion: And that our satisfactions are onely to pay for the temporall paynes remayning yet due, after the infinite are paid for by Christ. Nowe whether any such temporall payne remayne or no, after the sinne is remitted, is a question betwene vs: but to say (as M. P. R. doth) that we be Atheists, and doe denie God to be God, for that we hold some temporall punishment of man to be due, after pardon granted of his greater payne, is most apparantly a very senselesse assertion. As wide from all reason is his third instance: That Gods mercy cannot be infinite, when by our owne satisfactions we adde a supply to the satisfaction of Christ. For if Christs most perfect and full satisfaction, can well stand with Gods infinite mercy; farre more easily may mans satisfactions agree with it; which are infinitely lesse then Christs. But the infinite riches of Gods mercy appeareth especially, in that it pleased him freely to giue vnto vs. (Someane creatures and wretched sinners) his owne onely deare Sonne, to be our Redeemer and Saviour; and both Christs satisfaction & ours are rather to be referred vnto Gods justice, then to his mercy: wherefore very vn- skilfully doth M. P. R. compare them with Gods mercy. Neither is it possible to distill any quintessence of Atheisme out of it, more then out of the former: nay, they both vprightly weighed, are so farre of from Atheisme, or derogating any thing from Gods glory: that they doe much magnifie and aduance the same. For albeit we hold our good workes to be both meritorious and satisfactory: yet doe we teach the vertue, value, and estimation of them, to proceede wholly from the grace of God in vs, whereby we be enabled and holpen to doe them; and not any part of the dignity and worthynesse of the workes, to issue from the naturall faculty or industry of the man that doth them. So that when we maintayne the merite or satisfaction of good workes; we extoll not the nature of man, but doe onely defend and uphold the dignity and vertue of Gods grace: which Protestantes doe greatly debase, extenuate and vilifie, not allowing it to be sufficient to helpe the bestminded man in the world, to doe any worke that doth not offend God mortally. That much concerning our supposed Atheisme against God: nowe of those that be (as he imagineth) against Christ the Sonne of God: First he argueth thus: He that hath not the Sonne, hath not the Father: and he that hath neither Father nor Sonne, denies God: now the present Roman religion hath not the Sonne; charis Iesus Christi God and man: For they in effect abolish his man-hood, by teaching of him to haue two kindes of existing; one natural in heauen, whereby he is visible, touchable, and circumscribed: the other against nature, whereby he is substantially according to his flesh in the hands of euery Priest, inuisible and vncircumscribed.

Answer. M. P. R. and all Protestantes knowe right well, that we beleue Iesus Christ to be perfect God, and perfect man, and therefore we haue both the
Sonne

THE PREFACE

Sonne and the Father; and his reason against it, is not worth a rush: for we doe not destroy the nature of man, by teaching it to haue two diuers manners of existing or being in a place. When Christ was transfigured before his Apostles, he had another manner of outward forme and appearance; then he had before: yet was not the nature of man in him thereby destroyed, and after his resurrection he was (when it pleased him) visible to his Apostles, and at other times inuisible: and yet was not his man-hood thereby abolished; as M. PARIS would make vs beleene: no more is it when his body is in many places at once; or in one place circumscribed, and in the other vncircumscribed. For these externall relations of bodies vnto their places, doe no whit at all destroy their inward and naturall substances, as all Philosophie testifieth: wherefore hence to gather that we denie both the Father and the Sonne to be God, doth sauour (I will not say of a silly wit) but of a froward will, peeuishly bent to euill and calumnie. Secondly, Master PARIS et alenb vt with disgrading Christ of his offices: saying that for one Iesus Christ the onely King, lawe-giuer, and head of the Church, they ioine vnto him the Pope, not only as a Vicar, but as a fellowe, in that they giue vnto him power to make lawes binding: to conscience to resolu and determine infallibly the sence of holy Scripture: properly to pardon sinne: to haue authority ouer the whole earth, and a part of hell: to depose Kinges, to whome vnder Christ euery soule is subject: to absolue subjects from the oath of alleageance, &c.

Answer. Here is a bed-rolle of many superfluous speeches: for not one of all these things (if we admitte them all to be true) doth contradike or haue disgraded Christ of his offices: which are these: to appease Gods wrath on our behalf: to pay the ransom for our finnes: to conquer the Diuell: to open the Kingdoms of heauen: to be supreme head of both men and Angels, and such like. He may (without any derogation vnto these his soueraigne prerogatiues) giue vnto his seruants first, power to make lawes that binde in conscience, as he hath done to all Princes, which the Protestantes themselves dare not denie: then to determine vnfallibly of the true sence of holy Scripture, which the Apostles could doe as all men confesse; and yet doe not make them Christes fellowes: but his humble seruants: to whome also he gaue power properly to pardon finnes: whose finnes you pardon on earth, shal be pardoned in heauen; and finally, to them he also gaue authority ouer the whole earth: goe into the vniuersall world: ouer part of hell no Pope hath authority, and when he doth good to any soule in Purgatory, it is per modum suffragij, as a suppliant and entreater; not as a commander. Whether he hath any authority ouer Princes or their subjects in temporall affaires, it is questioned by some: yet no man (not wilfully blinde) can doubt, but that Christ might haue giuen him that authority, without disgrading himselfe of it, as he hath imparted to him and to others also, faculties of greater authority and vertue, requiring

Luc. 24.
Ioan. 20.
Mar. 16.
Matt. 28.

seruing neuertheless the same vnto himselfe, in a much more excellent manner. As a King by substituting a viceroy, or some such like deputie, to whom he giues most large commission, doth not thereby disgiude himselfe of his Kingly authori-ty, as all the world knowes: no more did our Saviour Christ lesse becaue himselfe of his power or dignitie, when he bestowed some part thereof vpon his substitutes. He goes on multiplying a number of idle wordes to small purpose: as that we for one Christ the only reall Priest of the newe Testament, joyne many secondary Priestes vnto him, which offer Christ daylie in the Masse. We indeede hold the Apostles to haue bene made by Christ, not imitative or phantastical, but reall and true Priestes. And by Christ his owne order and commandment, to haue offered his body and blood daylie in the sacrifice of the Masse; what of that? see that question. Furthermore he saith, for one Iesuscalle sufficient mediator of intercession, they haue added many fellowes to him, to make request for vs: namely as many Saintes as be in the Popes Kalendar: yea and many more too. For we hold that any of the faithfull yet lining, may be also requested to pray for vs: neither shall he in that be able to proue, that Christ on-ly maketh intercession for vs, though he be the only mediator that hath redeemed vs. Iustly saith M. PERKIN; for the only meritts of Christ, in whome alone the Father is well pleased, (what was he not well pleased with his Apostles?) they haue deuised a treasury of the Churches, containning besides the meritts of Christ, the ouerplus of the meritts of Saintes, to be dispensed to men at the discretion of the Pope, and thus we see that Christ and his meritts be abolished.

Answer. The good man is somewhat mistaken, for we hold not any ouerplus of meritts in Saintes, the which we acknowledge to be by God fully rewarded in heauen: but we affirme that some Saintes and blessed Martyrs haue suffered more paynes in this life, then the temporall punishment of their owne finnes. Iob 6. v. *Who therefore might truly say with that iust man Iob, would to God my finnes, whereby I haue deserued wrath, were weighed with the calamitie that I suffer: euen as the sandes of the Sea, this should be the heauyer. Nowe partie of these sufferings of Gods Saintes (as being needlesse for their owne satisfaction) are reserved in the Churches storehouse, and may by the high steward of the Church (to whom the dispensation of her treasure belongeth) be communicated to others; as very reason teacheth vs, for who is fitter to dispose of any mans goodes, then he to whom the charge thereof is giuen by his testament? And thus I hope every reasonable man doth finde vs Catholikes to be farre of from transforming Christ into an Idol of mans coniecture, as Master PERKINs dreameth: only we see a misconceited man, labouring in vain to deface Christs benefites toward vs, to calumniate his chiefe seruantes; and to skurish more against his owne phantasies, then against any do-*

THE PREFACE.

Crime of ours. He layeth lastly a third kinde of Atheisme against vs, for worshipping of God, not with such respect as is futable to his nature. For (saith he) our worshippe is meere will worshippinge for the most part, without any allowance or commandement of God, as Durand in his *Rationale* in effect acknowledgeth: it is a carnall seruice standing of innumerable bodily rites and ceremonies, borrowed partly from the Iewes, and partly from the Heathens: it is deuided betweene God and some of his creatures, in that they are worshipped both with one kinde of worshippe, let them paint it as they can, &c.

Answer. Ipse dixit: Pythagoras hath pronounced his sentence; yet you neede not beleue him; vnllesse you list, because he saileth so formally: doth Durand acknowledge that all our worship is meere will worship, and that it hath no allowance of God? O egregious and impudent deceiver! For that learned deuout Author Durand, doth nothing else in all that booke, then set out the Majesty and declared the meaning of the true worship of God, vsed daylie in our seruice throughout the whole yeare: And therefore doth entitle his booke *Rationale Diuinum*, the reasons of diuine seruice. And as for bodily rites, we vse but fewe, and those very decent, full of reuerence, and most fit to stirre vp and cherish deuotion. We be not spirits, and therefore must serue God by bodily ceremonies: although the life and vertue of them proceede from the spirit, employing all partes of the body, in his worshipp and to his honor that maketh: neither be they borrowed of Iewes nor of the Heathens; albeit they might perhaps (the one by the commandement of God, the other by the light of nature) vs some such like: but ours were deuised by the inspiration of the holy Ghost (the heavenly guide and director of the Catholike Church) to moue vs to serue God more deuotely, and with greater reuerence. Now to saye that we giue the same worship to any Saint that we giue to God, is a stale jest: that hath long since lost all his grace, being found to be nothing else, but a notorious vntuith very often confuted, as by others else where, so by me more then once in this booke: where also these other slanders here cast vpon vs, are more at large in their seuerall places discussed: this therefore may serue in this place for an answer to those imputations of Atheismes, which Master PERKINS objecteth against vs. And for that this crime of Atheisme is the most heynous that can be, as contrarie wise, the true opinion of the God-head and the sincere worshippe thereof, is the most sweete and beautifull flower of religion: let vs therefore, here (to hold due correspondence with Master PERKINS) examine the Protestantes doctrine, concerning the nature of God, and their worshippe of him, that the indifferent reader, comparing iudiciously our two opinions thereof together, may embrace that for most pure and true, that carryeth the most reuerent and holy conceits thereof. For out of all doubt, there can be no greater mooue to any deuout soule, to like of a religion, then to see that it doth deliuer a most sacred doctrine

of

THE PREFACE.

of the Soueraigne Lord of heauen and earth, and doth withall most religiously adore and serue him: Whereas on the other side, there is not a more forcible perswasion to forsake a religion before professed, then to be giuen to vnderstand, that the Masters of that religion, teach many absurde thinges concerning the God-head it selfe, and doe as coldly and as slightly worshipping God almighty, as may be. Marke therefore, I beseech thee (gentle reader) for thy owne soules sake, what euidence I shall deliuer in against the Protestantes, touching this point of Atheisme, and following the same method that M. P. E. R. obserueth, I will first touch their errors against the most blessed Trinity and Deity: secondly, such as are against our Lord Iesus God and man: lastly, I will speake one word or two about their seruice and worshipping of God: All which shall be performed in a much more temperate manner, then the gravity of such a matter requireth, that it may be lesse offensive. Concerning the sacred Trinity, it is by the doctrine of certayne principall pillars of their newe Gospell brought into great question. For Iohn Caluin in diuers places teacheth, that the second & third persons of the Trinity, doe not receiue the God-head from the first, but haue it of themselves, euen as the first person hath. And in this he is defended by M. Whitaker, and preferred before all the learned Fathers of the first councell of Nice. Out of which position it followeth, that there is neither Father nor Sonne in the God-head: for according vnto common sense, and the vniuerse consent of all the learned, he only is a true naturall Sonne, that by generation doth receiue his nature and substance from his Father. We are called the Sonnes of God, but that is by adoption and grace: but he only is the true naturall Sonne of God, that by eternall generation receiued his substance: that is, the God-head from him. If therefore the second person did not receiue the God-head from the first, but had it of himselfe, as they doe affirme: then certaynelie he is no true Sonne of the first, and consequently the first person is no true Father. For (as all men confesse) Father & Sonne be correlatiues, so that the one cannot be without the other. Thus their doctrine is found to be faulty in the highest degree of Atheisme. For it overthroweth both Father and Sonne in the Trinity. And further, if it were true, then doth the holy Ghost proceede neither from the Father, nor from the Sonne: for it receiueh not the God-head from them at all, as they hold: but hath it of himselfe, and so proceedeth no more from them, then they doe from him, & consequently is not the third person: Wherefore finally they doe overthrowe the whole Trinity, the Father, the Sonne, and the holy Ghost. Secondly, they may be truely stiled Atheistles, who thinke any one to be God, that hath not in him all singuler perfections, in the most perfect sort that can be, but either wanteth some of them, or else hath them in a meaner degree then any other: they therefore that teach our Saviour Christ in his God-head to be inferior vnto his Father, stand justly charged with Atheisme. Such a one is * Caluin who in formall termes doth a-
nouch and say, that Christ according to his God-head, is lesse then his Fa-
ther,

Lib. 1. In
stit. c. 13.
ff. 23. 25.
Con. ra-
tionem
Camp.
pag. 152.

* Epi. ad
Pol. pa.
940. &
seq.

THE PREFACE.

ther. And else where he affirmeth, the Father to hold the first ranke of honour In ca. 26, and power, and the Sonne to obtaine the second, which he might haue learned of his great master Melancthon, who taught that the Sonne according to Cō. Sean. his diuinity, is his Fathers subject and minister. Further, that in Christ car. in lo. there was something of the nature of God; some other thing then belike was cis, ca. de wanting. Again, that the God-head of Christ was obedient vnto his Fa- Christo; ther: with whome our country-men Iewell and Fulke doe jumpe, who affirme Cō. Har. that the diuine nature of Christ offered sacrifice vnto his Father. Briefly, diuig. art. all Protestantes (who hold Christ according to his diuine nature, to haue beene a 17. in the mediator) make his God-head inferiour vnto God the Father. For to be (as confuta, a mediator, must needs be) a suppliant vnto another: to pray and offer sacrifice to of the Pa- him, is to acknowledge him to be his better, and that something lyeth in his power pists slan to doe, which the other of himselfe cannot doe, but by sute must obtaine of him. ders.

Ioyne here vnto that they doe expound most of the textes of holy Scripture, vsed by the auncient Fathers to proue the blessed & sacred Trinity, euen as the old Arrians did, reproving the auncient Fathers exposition; which cannot but argue, that they in their bartes (though they be yet ashamed to confesse it) decline apace from those holy Fathers steps, to fauour Arrianisme. This litle therefore may suffice to demonstrate, howe the chiefe pillars of the Protestantes religion, doe shake the very foundations of the Christian faith, by their strange glosses and speeches about the sacred Trinity, and by their diuers derogations to Christes diuinity. But this shall appeare yet much more perspicuously, if we doe well weigh what they teach touching the very nature of the God-head it selfe. Whosoever denies God to be almighty, or presumes to limit the infinite power of God, within the compasse of mans weak vnderstanding, be in effect makes him no God at all, but some meane creature of a limited strength and power: such be all Protestantes, who affirme that God can Oecolap not set a body in the world, without a circumscribed place; nor any one de verbis body in many places at once, with such like: the which (because they cannot, Domini. out of the dulnesse of their witte, or will not off towardnesse, conceiue to be in na- Beza in- ture possible) they flatlie deny God to be able to doe: yea, some of them were so Neoph. blind and bold, as to auouch God, not to be able to conceiue or vnderstand, how that simil. cōc. is possible; which notwithstanding very naturall philosophy teacheth, to haue no And. pag repugnance in it selfe, as in his place I haue proued. If they were enemies to Gods 15. omnipotencie alone, it might be somewhat excused, because that might seeme to • In a cō- proceede rather from the weakenesse of their vnderstanding, then out of any illaf- ference fiction towards God: but if they doe further oppose themselves against the good- at Paris. nesse, mercy, and iustice of God; that must needs discouer very great impiety to lie festring in their bowels. Who seeth not, that it doth highly attainte the inesti- mable goodnesse of God, and his tender loue towards mankind, to impute the re- probation of man and his eternall damnation, not vnto mans owne wickednesse and

desertes, but vnto the meere will and pleasure of God himselfe? and yet this is too too common an assertion amongst the Protestantes. Let Beza one of their Monpel-branest champions, speake for the rest: God (saith he) in his secret counsell, hath set downe an vremouable decree, that he wil not haue the greater part of men sau'd, nor to beleue in Christ, and come to the knowledge of truth; but hath created, ordained, and predestinated them to euersling damnation. To whome M. PER. in this booke draweth neere, affirming it to proceede from the very wil of God, that he shewes mercy to some and forsaketh others. Mercy (indeede) God of his meere goodnes doth p'wre out vpon vs abundantly: but to imagine that he of his owne will and prime choise, without any foresight of our sinnes, doth forsake vs, and appoint vs to hell fire, is beyonnd impiety, most contrary vnto the very nature of God; whose goodnesse is so pure and sincere, that it doth good to all thinges, and misbeth euill to none; vnlesse they doe first greatly deserue it. What an vngodly opinion then is it, to hold that he of his owne free choise ordained man (a creature made to his owne Image and likeness) to most grievous and endlesse torments, without foresight of any offence of his? Although he should take a singular pleasure, to see a principall worke of his owne handes, fry in hell fire.

Another opinion some of them hold, which is yet much more blasphemous then the other, to wit: that God, who hath bene alwaies by good men esteemed the author of all good, and so meere good in his owne nature and will, that he cannot possibly doe or thinke any euill: that this Ocean (I say) of goodnesse, is become the author, plotter, promoter, and worker of all the wickednesse and mischiefe, that is, or hath bene committed in the world. This is the doctrine of Zwinglius a great Rabin among the newe Gospellers; who auoucheth that when we commit either adultery, murder, or any such like crime, that it is the worke of God, he being the authour, mouing and pushing vs on to doe it. Again, that the theefe by Gods motion and perwasion, murthereth, and is often times compelled to sinne. With him agreeth Bucer, sometimes a professor of divinity in the vniuersitie of Cambridge; censuring him to denie God finally, who doth not humely beleue, that God doth worke in man, as well all euill, as all good. Of the same accused crue was Melanethon, who vpon the 8. chapter to the Romanes, saith: Euen as we confesse Pauls vocation to haue bin Gods proper worke: so doe we acknowledge these to be the proper workes of God, which are either indifferent, as is to eate and drinke, or that are euill, as the adultery of Dauid, and such like. For it is euident out of the first to the Romanes, that God doth all thinges mightely (as Augustine speaketh) & not permissiuely: so that the treason of Iudas is as properly the worke of Li. 1. Infi. God, as the calling of Paul. But the principall proffor and promoter of this blas- c. 18. ff. 1. phemy is Caluin, who of set purpose bestowes a whole chapter of his Institutions, to

bell, to proue and perswade it. There be auoucheth boldly, that the blinding and madnesse of Achab, was the will and decree of God: that Absolon indeede defiling his fathers bed with incestuous adultery, committed derestable wickednes; yet this was Gods owne worke: briefly, that nothing is more plaine, then that God blindeth the eies of men, striketh them with giddines, maketh them drunke, casteth them into madnes, and hardneth their hares. And where as the poore Papists were wont to interpret such textes of Scripture, as seme to attribute these things to God, by saying, that God doth indeede justly permit, and suffer such things to be done, but is not the author of them: this Calvin will not in any wise admettre of, but in the same place confutes it, saying. These things many referre to sufferance, as if in forsaking the reprobate, he suffered them to be blinded by Satan: but that solution (saith he) is too fond, and so goeth on, prouing that God doth not only suffer, but actually effect and worke all the euill, that any man committeth: yea, he addeth that which is more horrible: that God doth worke this euill in man, by Satans seruice as a meane; yet so as God is the principall worker of it, and the Diuell but his instrument. Is not this blasphemy in the highest degree, to make God a more principall author, and worker of all wickednesse, done in the world, then the Diuell himselfe? this is much worse then flat Atheisme: for it is the lesser impiety of two to hold that there is no God at all, then to beleene that God worketh more effectually all mischiefe, then the infernal spirits doe. But some of our Protestants wil perhaps say, that they hold not this opinion: be it so, for I thinke better of many of them: yet, be not these men that so teach, as it were the founders of the newe Gospell, and men of chiefest marke among them? No we what force such principall authours (as they take Melancthon, Zwinglius, Bucer, and Calvin to be) may haue, to carry the rest away into the same errors, I knowe not. Sure I am, that Caluins Institutions (wherein this matter is so vehemently vrged) is translated into English, and in the Preface commended to all students of Christian diuinity, as one of the most profitable (the holy Scriptures excepted) for the sound declarations of truth in articles of religion.

But to proceede on with this discourse: the Protestants doe not only impugne the power & goodnes of God: but they doe also peruert his justice. For to omit their last position, that God is the worker of all sinne in vs, compelling (as Calvin speaketh) thereprobate to obedience; and therefore cannot in justice punish the poore wretches, for being obedient vnto his owne will and working: and not to vrg their former assertion, that God of his owne wil & decree, hath predestinated the greater part of men to hell, without any foresight of their euill desertes: which if it were true, should it not be intolerable wronge, to torment so rigorously innocents, that neuer offended him? To let passe these points (I say) how can they defend the justice of God, who hold that he hath tyed vs to such lawes, as are impos-

Math. 7. fible to be kept by any man? For Christ (as he testified himselfe) will condemne
 verſ. 23. men to hell fire for tranſgreſſing of theſe lawes, by working of iniquity; depart
 from me you that worke iniquity: and what equity ſhould there be in that ſen-
 tence, if it had neuer beene poſſible for theſe men to haue done other wiſe? For no
 reaſonable Iudge condemneſt any man for not doing of that, which he knewe well,
 lay not any way in his power to be done. So that nothing is more plaine and eu-
 ident, then that the Proteſtantes doctrine trotteſt apace to wardes open Atheiſme:
 by impugning the power of God: by defacing his goodneſſe, mercy, and juſtice,
 which in our vnderſtanding are the chiefe properties of his diuine ſubſtance:
 and by calling into queſtion the bleſſed Trinity it ſelfe, which their of-ſpring and
 progeny the Trinitarians in Poland doe already denie flatly.

Thus much of their Atheiſmes againſt God. Nowe to thoſe that be againſt
 our Sauour Chriſt Ieſus: I haue before touched their errors concerning his God-
 head, here I will ſpeake of thoſe that be againſt his Man-hood, and Mediatorſhip.
 Firſt, it muſt needes argue in them a great want of good affection towards our Sa-
 uour, that they are ſo backward in his bleſſed Mother the holy Virgins praifes,
 not hearing with patience, any body that would ſo much as ſalute her with the
 Luc. 1. Haile MARY, which not withſtanding is recorded in the Goſpell: and are beſides
 ſo ready vpon every litle occaſion, to ſpeake in her diſpraiſe, that we may with good
 reaſon reprove them, as men either wanting judgement (which they will not endure
 of any thing) or elſe woide of due reſpect vnto the Sonne, who are ſuch aduerſaries to
 the Mother: whome if they would not reuerence for her owne vertues, which were
 moſt rare and ſingular, yet for her Sonnes ſake (who loued her ſo tenderly) they
 ſhould ſhew themſelues better affected towards her, and more forward in her
 praifes, if they did indeede loue and honour her Sonne, as they pretend to doe.

But let vs come to Chriſtes owne perſon. Whereas the firſt Adam was (at the
 firſt inſtance of his creation) replenished with perfect knowledge: and it is alſo
 Ioh. 1. in holy write ſaid of the ſecond, that the word was made fleſh, full of grace
 In cap. 2. and truth: Yet they commonly teach, that our Sauours ſoule was ſubject to
 Lu. v. 52. ignorance, euen as other mens ſoules are: & that he was in his youth ignorant
 Colloſ. 2. of many things. But what and they ſpare him not (in whome all the trea-
 verſ. 4. ſures of wiſdome and knowledge were hidden) when he came to ripe yeeres,
 and beganne nowe to preach? let vs for a ſeaſe, beare ſome of Caluins ſweete ob-
 ſervations vpon the text of the Goſpell, becauſe the purer brethren complaine
 *Ex Cal- much, that M. Caluins workes are in no greater requeſt. Chriſt (ſaith he)
 uin. Tur- ſpeaketh improperly, Math. 6. verſ. 18. he vſeth harſh and far-fetched ſi-
 li. 7. c. 13. militudes: he wreſteth the Prophetes wordes into a ſtrange ſence: he v-
 Luc. 16. ſeth triviall and vulgar proverbes, as probable conjectures, not as ſound
 Math. 7. argumentes, which he willet vs to beare in minde, as a thing often practiſed
 Ioh. 1. by our Sauour, in Math. ca. 12. verſ. 25. Luc. 21. verſ. 17. he ſpeaketh after
 the

THE PREFACE

33

the manner of men, not out of his heavenly cabinette; *Mat. 11. vers. 21.* which is no lesse in plaine English, then that he spake *Mat. 11. vers. 21.* as men doe. And very sutable to this he noteb else where, that Christ could not gette any other In cap. 7. to be his Disciples, then some certaine poore fellowes of the refuse and Lu. v. 29. dregges of the people. Seeme not these execrable notes to issue from the pen of some malicious Iewe, or ranke Atheist? yet are they but flea-bitings in comparison of those which followe. In his commentary vpon these wordes of our Saviour: Father if it be possible, let this chalice or cuppe passe from me. *He obser. Mat. 26. vers. 39.* First, that this prayer of Christ was vnadvisedly made: secondly, that he ouercome with griefe, had forgotten the heavenly decree; not remembring for the time, that he was sent to be the redeemer of mankind: thirdly, that he withstood as much as in him lay; and refused to execute the office of a mediator. See Caluin also vpon these wordes of Christ: Father, Ioh. 12. saue me from this houre: where he saith, that Christ was so strooken with vers. 27. feare, and so pinched on euery side with perplexed pensiuensse, that he was forced through these boisterous waues of temptation, to wauer and flecte too and fro in his prayers and petitions. Is not this pitifull impiety? Where as our most louing redeemer, of set purpose tooke that feare vpon him, and most willingly both suffered, and caused that bloody agony and conflict, by representing vnto him selfe, both the shame and paine of his dolorous passion, and the causes thereof (which were the innumerable most grievous sinnes of the world) that he might in euery part both of minde and body, endure what he possibly could, for the time; and spake nothing rashly, but repeated that his prayer ouer thre severall times, as is set downe in the text it selfe; to shewe vs howe naturally he (as all other men) did abhorre such a cruell and ignominious death: and yet withall to instruct vs, that we should be content with it, and pray to God for strength to beare it, if it were his blessed will to put vs to the like. This wholesome doctrine and Godly instructions, are by the auncient holy Fathers gathered out of that prayer of Christ: what a venemous spider then was Caluin, to sucke such poison out of it? if Christ so wauered, where was his constancy? if he were so frighted (as Caluin fashly imagineth) where was his fortitude? if he strugled so against his Fathers decree, where was his obedience? if he refused to redeeme vs, what was become of his charity towards mankind? if the first motions to euill be deadly sinnes in vs (as the Protestantes hold) what will they make of such tumultuous and vbridled passions in him, that had a greater command ouer them, then we haue? But we are not yet come vnto the hight of his blasphemies, which he powreth forth more abundantly vpon those our Saviours wordes: My GOD, my GOD, why hast thou forsaken me? *Mat. 27. saying: when this kinde of temptation was proposed to Christ (as though vers. 46. God being auerted from him, he had bene appointed to vtter destru. Li. 2. In-ction) he was seised with horror. * And in his Institutes treating of the same stit. c. 16.*

*Subject saith: Christ feared to haue beene swallowed vp of death as a sinner: And there can be no more dreadfull bottomelesse gulfe, then for a man to feele himselfe forsaken and estranged from God, & not to be heard, when he calleth vpon him, euen as if God had conspired his destruction: euen thither we see that Christ was throwne downe, so that by enforcement of distresse he was compelled to crie out: my God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me. In the Paragraphe before, he speaketh more plainly, that Christ did hand in hand wrestle with the armies of hel, & the horror of eternal death: finally, that in his soule he suffered the torments of the damned, and al those punishments that are due to wicked men in hell: He then (belike) was the traitor Iudas companion: for the while he was in the Diuels handes to be tormented, he despaired and feared as men doe in the hellish torment. What greater blasphemy can be imagined, then to condemne the King of heauen, that came to redreame vs all from hell, euen to be very pittie of hell in selfe: Beza not willing to come behinde his master Caluin in this kinde of impiety, whereas Caluin crassly admitted only, that Christ then despaired, he affirmeth plainly: that from Christ ad Hebr. (strooken with the horror of Gods curse) escaped the word of desperati-
verf. 7. on. And also where, that Christ was (with the huge heauie burden of Gods wrath, overwhelmed and adjudged to the flames of hell: yea, buried and
In ca. 27. drowned in the bottome of the infernall gulfe: This man (you see) desires to
Math. & ledge Christ lowe enough, that would haue him drowned in the very bottome of hell.
22. Luc. This their pestilent venime, they might haue sucked out of their good grandfather Luthers writings, who vpon the very same wordes, doth make this goodly commenta-
ry. What shall we therefore say: Christ to haue bin together both the most
In Psal. 22. ver. 1. just, and greatest sinner: both the most notorious lier, and truest teacher: at the same instant, both the most highly glorying, & deeply despairing: both happy in the highest degree, & most miserably damned. Vnlesse we say this, I see not (saith this Oracle of the newe Gospell) howe Christ was forsaken of God. See him also vpon the third chapter to the Galatians, where he viterly yet more detestable speeches of Christ, to wit: that all the Prophets did in the spirit foresee him to be the greatest theefe, robber, murderer, adulterer, sacrilegious person and blasphemor, that euer liued. I could cite you diuers others of the same opinion, but I had rather note their extreame blindness, who neglecting the auncient Fathers learned expositions of the holy Scriptures, were leade away with such horrible extravagant conceites of our Sauour, vpon so small occasion. For be at that very time hanging on the Crosse, declared himselfe to be most farre of from all such hellish torments: yea, he shewed all possible signes of a most quiet and peaceable minde, praying for the saluation euen of his persecutors. (he was not then belike in doubt of his owne) promising also to the good theefe that the same day he should be with him in Paradise: wherefore he doubted nothing*

THE PREFACE.

15

nothing of being there himselfe: recommending his Mother vnto his beloued Disciple, and him likewise to her; and to fulfill the Scriptures, both saying I thirst, and citing euen those very wordes, that they are scandalized at; out of one of the Psalmes of David: And finally, aduisedly considering all thinges belonging to his passion, to be accomplished, commended his spirit vnto his Fathers handes: so that there could not possibly be more calme settled judgement, more valiant constancy & resolution, then there was. But what must be then to say, my GOD, my GOD, why hast thou forsaken me? Forsooth nothing else, but to signifie, that in all these torments which he suffered, he had not any comfort or consolation at that time from God, who is wont to giue extraordinary aide and comfort to all those, that suffer for his names sake: but that Christ might (as he himselfe desired) be put to suffer all kinde of extremity, all manner of inward consolation was wholly withheld from him; which it pleased him then to expresse by manner of complaint in those most pittifull wordes: My GOD, my GOD, &c. the more to moue vs to compassion. Thus much of their impieties against Christes person: now to those that they teach against the office of his mediatorshippe.

They hold first, that whatsoever our Saviour did or suffered before his passion, was of smal value for our redemption. For as a noble Protestant said, the Monkes, Moline-Priestles, and Papiesticall Doctors did erre, when they vrged Christes incarnation and natiuity: for all these thinges profited vs nothing; could doe monia, nothing: but only the death of Christ, which alone was accepted of God part. 51. for our finnes. Secondly, Caluine goeth further, and doubteth not to say, that Christes passion and corporall death would not serue the turne, and had Li. 2. In-profitd vs nothing at all, had he not in his soule suffered the very paines stie. ca. 16 of the damned in hell. This doctrine of theirs is not only contrary to an hundred places of expresse Scripture, that doe assigne our redemption vnto the blood-shedding and passion of Christ: but it also derogateth very much from the dignity of our Mediatour. For not that which he suffered, made the merite of our redemption: but it was his exceeding charity, with which he suffered it, and principally the very dignity of his diuine person, which gaue that value, price, and estimation to his sufferings; that the very least thing that euer he suffered in his life, was of infinite value; and therefore sufficient to pay the ransom of all mankind: yea, to haue redeemed a thousand worldes. But let vs proceede on with the Protestantes opinion: did Christes sufferings of the tormentes of hell deserue of God in justice, the redemption of man? not so, if we may beleeuue one of Foxes Martirs, who held (as be recordeth) that Christ with all his workes could not merite heauen for vs. But for that little credit it is to be giuent to such a Martir, and such a Martir-monger, let vs heare what some of the learneſt amongst them say. I truly confesse (saith Caluine) that if a man will set Christ singly and by himselfe, against the judgements of God, there will be no roome for merit.

Sub

Actes &
monu-
ments.
pag. 487

THE PREFACE.

L.2. Infti. *And after*: Christ could not deserue any thing, but by the good pleasure
 c.17. Cl.1. of God. Finally, the desertings of Christ depend vpon the only grace of
 In abster. God, which is defended by his disciple Beza against Helthsius: so that briefly,
 calumni. all Christes sufferings in bell and out of bell, in true Protestant reckoning, amount
 Helth. to no higher a value, then that by the good pleasure and acceptance of God, they de-
 served our redemption; therefore in rigour of justice they were not of sufficient
 worth to redeeme vs; but were only of grace, by God accepted for such. Is not here a
 faire reckoning? so might any other man endued with grace haue redeemed al man-
 kinde as well as Christ, if it had pleased God to haue so accepted it; seing no equall
 recompence was to be expected. But to helpe him here by the way, that could not
 understand how we were saued by the mercy of God: if Christes merittes did in ju-
 stice deserue our saluation, it is to be noted that both be true, if they be duely con-
 sidered. For we are saued by Christes merittes in rigour of justice, be satisfying of God
 as far-forth fully; as we offended him: and yet we be saued freely by the mercy
 of God too; both, because he hath of his meere mercy without any desert of ours,
 giuen vs Christ his Sonne to be our Saviour: and also for that he hath (out of the
 same his mercy) freely applyed vnto euery one in particular that is saued, the merittes
 of Christ; through which he is saued.

To returne to our purpose, and to discouer yet more of the Protestantes disgraces
 offered to our Saviours mediation. Did Christ suffer his passion for the redemption
 Co. Hesh of all mankind, or did he die only for some fewe of the elect? let Caluin answer
 pag. 39. yea. Christes flesh was not crucified for the vngodly, neither was the
 Sup. Ioh. blood of Christ shed to cleanse their finnes. With him agreeth brother Bucet:
 pag. 39. Christ by his death did only redeeme the finnes of the elect. Musculus wil
 In locis beare a part in that consort: Christes death is a satisfaction only for the
 fol. 361. finnes of the elect; all as contrary to the plaine text of Scripture, as can be.
 1. Ioh. 2. Christ is a propitiation for our finnes (where he spake in the person of the elect)
 vers. 2. and not for ours only, but also for the whole worldes. Let vs goe on yet one
 step further. What effect doth the blood of Christ worke in the small number of
 these elected brethren? Doth it cleanse their soules from al filth of sinne, and powre
 into them the manifold gifter of the holy Ghost, whereby they may afterward resist
 sinne, and serue God in holynesse of life; nothing lesse. For in the regenerate (as
 Pag. 31. M. PERKINS with all the rest of them doth teach) there remaineth originall
 sinne, which infecteth euery worke of man, and maketh it a mortall sinne.
 So that inwardly in their soules these elected Protestantes, be voides of justice, and
 full of all manner of iniquity: marry, they haue created in them the rare instrument
 of a newe deuised faith, by which they lay hold on Christes justice, and so by reall
 imputation (so vs M. PERKINS wordes) of Christes justice to them, they on
 the suddaine becomie exceeding just: therefore Frier Luther had some reason to
 say, that who soeuer was borne againe of this Euangelicall faith, was equall in
 grace

grace vnto both Peter and Paul; and vnto the Virgin MARY Mother of Supra 1.
 God: Nay, it seemes that Luther came to short, and Zwinglius strooke home Pet. 1.
 when he said: that God the Father did no lesse fauour all the faithfull, then In actis
 he did Christ his owne Sonne. And out of the confidence of the same liuely-fee-
 ling faith, proceeded these speeches of our newe Gospellers in England. And we disput.
 haue as much right to heauen, as Christ hath; we cannot be damned, vn-
 lesse Christ be damned: neither can Christ be saued, vnlesse we be saued. Tigur.
 Christ (belike) could not liue in blisse without their holy company. What audacious Fox Aet.
 companions, and saucy Gospellers were these? yet their reason seemeth sound in fol. 1335.
 the way of their owne religion: for if they were most assured of the benefite of Christs & 1138.
 owne iustice to be imputed vnto them, they could not be lesse assured of their owne
 saluation, then they were of Christes owne. To conclude this point, consider (good
 reader) howe the Protestantes (who would be thought to magnifie Christes suffer-
 ings exceedingly) doe in very deepe extreamely debase them. For (as you haue
 heard) they esteeme very litle of all the rest of his life, besides his passion: secondly,
 they make his passion without suffering of hell tormentes, not sufficient to redreeme
 vs: thirdly, that all those sufferings put togither, doe not in iustice merit the re-
 mission of our sinnes, but only that of grace and curtesie, God doth accept them for
 such: fourthly, that when all is done, they deserue fauour only for a few of the elect,
 and that not to purge those fewe neither from all their sinnes, but only to purchase
 them an imputation of iustice, to be apprehended by a strong imagination or rather
 presumption, falsely by them tearned faith. Is not here a huge great mill-post, faire-
 ly thwisted into a poore pudding pricke (as they say) by them, who after so high ex-
 altations of the all-sufficiency of Christes suffering, doe in fine conclude, that in a
 very fewe persons it worketh only an imputation or shadowe of iustice: but it agre-
 eth very well and hangeth hand somely together, that by the merits of Christes suf-
 ferings in hell, (which are meere phantasticall) these men should haue created in
 them a phantasticall faith, neuer heard of before their dayes, to lay hold vpon a
 vaine shadowe of an imputation and phantasticall iustice.

But to returne vnto Christes mediatorship and merits. Is it not moreouer a grea-
 disparagement vnto them, to maintayne (as the Protestantes doe) that his best be-
 loued spouse the Church, should continue but a small time, at least in any sight, and
 should be penned vp in corners: yea, and during that time too, it should not be free
 from many foule grosse errors, in the very foundation of faith? Furthermore, that
 he lest his holy word (the only rule and square (as they hold) of Christian religion)
 to be vnderstood of euery man as his owne knowledge and spirit should direct him?
 and if any doubtfull question did arise there about (as he fore-saw he thousand
 should doe) yet he tooke no other order for the deciding and ending of them, but that
 euery one should repaire vnto the same his word, and doing his diligence to vnder-
 stand it, might after ward be his owne iudge. As this later opinion would argue our

blessed Saviour, who was the wisdom of God, to be the weakest and most imprudent lawe-maker that euer was: so the former doth mightily blemish the inestimable price of his most precious blood, making it not of sufficient value, to purchase into him an euerm-lasting inheritance, free from all errors in matter of faith, and abounding in all good workes.

To fold vp this part, let me entreate thee (curteous reader) to be an upright judge betwene the Protestantes doctrine and ours, in this most weighty matter of Christes dignity, vertues, and mediation; and if thou see most evidently, that ours doth more aduance them, why shouldst thou not giue sentence on our side? They make Christ ignorant many yeares of his life: we hold him from the first instant of his conception, to haue bene replenished with most perfect knowledge. They, that bespake and taught now and then, as other men did, and was subject to disordinate passions: We, that he was most free from all such, and that he taught alwaies most diuinely. They make his very death not sufficient to redeme vs: we hold that the least thing that euer he suffered in his life, deserved the redemption of many worldes. They, that he died only for the elect: we, that he died for all, though many through their owne fault, doe not receiue any benefit by his death. They, that thereby we are not purged from our sinnes, but by imputation: we, that all are by the vertue thereof inwardly cleansed. They, that Christ purchased a Church consisting of fewe, not to continue long, and subject to many errors: we, that he established a Church, that should be spreadde ouer all the world, and that should continue to the end of the world visibly, and alwaies free from any error in any matter of faith. Finally, they hold that Christ left his holy word to the disputation of men, not taking any certaine order for the ending of controuersies, that should arise about it: we teach, that he hath established a most assured meanes, to decide all doubtres in religion, and to hold all obedient Christians in perfect vniformity, of both faith and manners. And because I am entred into these comparisons, giue me leaue to persist yet a litle longer in them. Consider also (I pray you) who goes nearer to Acheisme, either we, that thinke and speake of the most sacred Trinity, as the blessed Fathers in the first Councell of Nice taught: or they, who directly crosse them, and by the nouelty of their phrases, doe breed newe, or rather reuiue old heresies against it. Againe, who carry a more holy conceit of God, either they, who vpon light occasion doe rashly denie God to be able to doe that, which they doe not conceiue possible: or we, that teach him to be able to doe tenne thousand thinges, that passe our vnderstanding. Whither they, that affirme God of his owne free choise, to cast away the greater part of men: or we, that defend him to desire the saluation of all men, and not to be willing that any one perishe, vnlesse it be through his owne default. Either they, that hold him to be the author of all euill done in the world, and the Diuell to be but his Minister therein:

THE PREFACE

19

therein: or we, that maintayne him to be so purely good, that he cannot possibly either concurre to any euill, or so much as once to thinke to doe any euill. Finally, whose opinion of him is better, either ours, that hold him to haue bene so reasonable in framing of his lawes, that he doth by his grace make them easie to a willing minde: or theirs, that auouch him to haue giuen lawes impossible for the best men to keepe? If some Protestantes doe say, we doe not maintayne diuers of these positions. I answer that it is, because they doe yet in part hold with vs, and are not so farre gone, as they doe wholly followe their newe masters: For if they did, then should they embrace all the afore-said damnable positions, being so plainly taught by their principall preachers and teachers. These therefore are to warne my deere Country-men, to looke to it in time; and then (no doubt) but that all such as haue a sufficient care of their saluation, considering maturely whither the current and streame of the newe Gospell carrieth them, will speedily disbarke themselves thence, least at length they be driuen by it, into the bottomlesse gulfe of flat Atheisme.

And is it any great meruaile, that the common sort of the Protestantes fall into so many foule absurdities touching religion, when as the very fountaines, out of which they pretend to take their religion, be so pittifully corrupted? I meane the sacred word of God. Master Gregory Martin a Catholike man, very skilfull in the learned languages, hath discovered about two hundreth of their corruptions of the very text of Gods word: and after him one Master Broughton a man of their owne (esteemed to be singularly seene in the Hebrew and Greeke tongue) hath aduertised them of more then eight hundreth fautes there in. And the matter is so euident, that the Kinges Majestie, in that publike conference holden at Hampton-Court, in the first of his raigne, confesseth himselfe not to haue seene one true translation of the Bible in English; and that of Geneva, which they were wont to esteeme most, to be the worst of all others: and therefore commanded them to goe in hand with a newe translation; about which, fifty of the most learned amongst them in both Vniuersities (as it is credibly reported) haue this three yeares trauailed, and cannot yet hitte vpon, or else not agree vpon, a newe sincere and true translation. Here is a large field offered me to exclaime against such corrupters and deprauers of Gods sacred word: but I will leaue that to some other time, because I haue bene to long already. But what a lamentable case is this! they hold for the most assured pillar of their faith, that all matters of saluation must be fished out of the Scriptures, and crie vpon all men to search the Scriptures: and yet are the same Scriptures by themselves so peruersly mangled, that their owne pew-fellowes crie out shame vpon them therefore: wherevnto (if it please you) joyne, that the Protestantes haue no assured meanes to be resouled of such doubtles and difficulties, as they shall find in the same word of God. For they must neither trust ancient Father,

nor relie vpon the determination, either of nationall or generall Councells; but euery faithfull man (by himselfe) examining the circumstances of the text, and considering other like places vnto it together, shall finde out the right meaning of all obscure sentences, as they most childishly beare their followers in hand. Briefly to conclude this point, a great number of them hauing Gods word corrupted, for the lantern to their secte, and their owne dimme sight, for their best guide: no maruaile, though they stumble at many difficulties in these high misteries, and fall into very absurd opinions, concerning the principall partes of them.

Nowe to make vp an euen reckoning with M. PER. Atheisme, I must come vnto their diuine seruice and worship of God, the thiyd point that I promised to handle; because he spared not to speake his pleasure of ours. First then, whereas a true, reall, and externall sacrifice, is among all externall workes, the most excellent seruice that can be done to the diuine Majestie, as shall be proued in the question of the sacrifice; which also hath euery since the beginning of the world, bene by the best men practised, to acknowledge and testifie, as well the soueraigne domination that God hath ouer vs, as our dutifull subiection vnto his almighty goodnesse: the Protestantes to make knowne vnto the wiser sorte, that they are not Gods true loyall people, will not vouchsafe to performe to him any such speciall seruice, as to sacrifice in his honour: nay they are fallen so farre out with this principall part of Gods true worship, that they doe in despite of it, powre our most vile reproches against the daylie sacrifice of the Catholike Church, which containeth the blessed body and most precious bloud of our redeemer IESVS. CHRIST. Secondly, of seauen Sacraments (instituted by our Saniour, both to exhibite honour to God, and to sanctifie our soules) they doe flatly reject foure of them: And doe further (as much as in them lieth) extinguisht the vertue and efficacy of the other two. For they hold Baptisme not to be the true instrument all cause of remission of our sinnes, and of the infusion of grace into our soules; but only to be the signe and scale thereof. And in steade of Christes sacred body, really giuen to all Catholikes in the Sacrament of the Altar, to their exceeding comfort and dignity, the Protestantes must be content to take vp with a bitte of bread, and with a suppe of wine: a most pittifull exchange, for so heauenly a banquet. They doe daylie feele (and I would to God they had grace to vnderstand) what a want they haue of the Sacrament of Confession, which is the most soueraigne salve of the world, to cure all the deadly and dangerous woundes of the soule. Ah howe carelesly doe they daylie heape sinne vpon sinne, and suffer them to lie festring in their breastes euery till death, for lacke of launcing them in season by true and due confession! Besides, at the point of death, when the Diuell is most busie to assault vs, labouring then to make vs his owne for euery, there is amongst them no anointing of the sick with holy oyle in the name of our Lord, (as S. Iames prescribeth) joyned with the Priestes prayer, which should saue the sick, and by meanes whereof his sinnes should be forgiven, and he lifted

THE PREFACE

31

vp by our Lord, and inwardly both greatly comforted and strengthened: these beauenly helpes (I say) and many others, which our Catholike religion afford vnto all persons, & by which rightly administred, God is highly magnified, are quite banished out of the Protestant territories, and consequently their religion for want of them, is mightily maymed. They haue yet remayning some poore short prayers to be said twice a weeke: for feare (belike) to make their Ministers surfetted of ouer much praying, they will not tie them to any daylie prayers: Mattins, Euen-song, and other set houres they leaue to the Priestles, sauing that on the Sabbath they solemnly meete together at the Church, to say their service, which is a certayne mingle-mangle, translated out of the old portails and Masse booke, patched vp together with some fewe of their owne inuentions. And though it be but short, yet it is (the Lord be knowes) performed by most of them so slightly, that an indifferent beholder, would rather iudge them to come thither to gaze one vpon another, or to common of worldly businesse, then reuerently there to serue God. Nowe as concerning the place where their diuine seruice is said: if goodly stately Churches, had not bene by men of our religion built to their handes, in what simple coates (I rowe you) would their key-cold deuotion haue bene content to serue their Lord? if one Church or great steeple, by any mishap fall into vtter ruine, a collection throughout all England for many yeares together, will not serue to build it vp againe: which maketh men of iudgement to perceiue, that their religion is exceeding cold in the setting forward of good workes, and that it rather tendeth to destruction, then to edification. Again, whereas our Churches are furnished with many goodly Altars, trimmed vp decently, and garnished with sundry faire and religious pictures, to strike into the beholders a reuerent respect of that place, and to drawe them to beauenly meditations: theirs haue ordinarily bare walles, banded with cob-webs except some of the better sort, which are daubed like Ale-houses, with some broken sentences of Scripture. Besides, the ancient custome of Christians, being to pray with their faces towards the Sunne rising, to shewe the hope they haue of a good resurrection, and that by tradition receiued euen from the Apostles, as witnesseth Saint Basil: their Ministers in their highest mysteries, looke ouer their communion table into the South: to signifie (perhaps) that their spirituall estate is now at the highest, and that in their religion there is no hope of rising towards heauen, but assurance of declining.

I may not here omitte, that of late yeares they haue caused the Kinges armes to be set vp in the place, where Christes armes the Crucifix was wont to stand: the which I confesse would haue graced their Church better, if it had bene else where placed. But I hope they will giue me leaue to aske them, howe they durst set vp any such Images in their Churches, as be in that armes. For they haue taught hitherto, that it is expressly against the second commandment, and a kind of Idolatry, not only to worshipping Images, but also to set them vp in Churches: and yet now

(as it were) cleane forgetting themselves, they fall into that fault themselves, that they haue so much blamed in others. Neither will it helpe them to say, that they reprobued only the setting vp of holy pictures, but not of others. For the second commandment (as they expound it) is as well against the one as the other, forbidding generally the making of any kind of Image. And is it not a pittifull blindness to thinke, that the pictures of Lions and Liberts doe better become the house of God, then the Image of his owne Sonne, and of his faithfull seruants? And may not simple people thinke, when they see Christes armes cast downe, and the Princes set vp in their place, that there dwell men, who make more account of their Princes honour, then they doe of Christes? And that their meeting in that place (call it what you wil) is rather to serue their Prince, then to serue Christ. But I haue bene longer in their place of prayer then I thought.

I come now to the men that are elected to serue the Lord there. Be not many of them (for the whole corps I will not touch) such as Ieroboam was glad to choose, when he made a Schisme in Israel: to wit, *de extremis populi, qui non erant de filiis Levi*: not lawfull successors of the true Priestes, but others of the baser sort of the people, and them commonly that are not able, either for ignorance or some other odde quality: and must they not also fill their good patrons bandes with some feeling commodity, before they can gette a benefice? And so beginning with simonie, lincked with perjurie (for the poore fellows must neuerthelesse sweare, that they come freely to their benefice) are they not like to proceede on holily? As for the vow of chastity, the daylie seruice and often fasting, which Catholike Priestes are bound vnto, they by the sweet liberty of the newe Gospell, doe exchange into solacing themselves with their yoke-fellows: this of the common sort of their Ministers. With their preachers I will not meddle for feare of offence: yet if any desire to knowe howe they behaue themselves in other countries, they may read the censure of a zealous learned preacher, one of their owne companions, who amongst many

Mennol. other thinges writeth thus of them. When you come to preachers, who de Christ bragge that they haue the word of God, you shall find certaine of them fide. titul. manifest liars, others drunkers, some vsurers and foule-mouthed slanderers, some persecutors and betrayers of harmlesse persons. Howe some mulieris of them behaue themselves, and by what meanes they gette their wiues, Cananez and what kind of wiues they haue, that I leaue to the Lord and them.

They liue an idle, slothfull and voluptuous life: by fraude and flattery they feed themselves of the spoiles of Antichrist (he meaneth the benefices taken from the Papists) and doe preach just as the earthly and carnall Magistrate desireth to heare, and will permitte, &c. So much, and not a little more, speaketh one great Master of the late reformation, concerning his Euangelicall bretheren. Are not these goodly lampes of the newe Gospell, and likely persons to be chosen by Christ, to giue light to others, and to reforme the world? But per ad-

uerture

menture they haue in some secret corners, certaine deuout religious soules, who in an austere retired life, doe with continuall teares bewaile the sinnes of the rest, and make incessant sute vnto the Almighty, for a generall pardon of the whole. Would to God they had, but I feare me that they be of their inuisible congregation, or rather none such to be found amongst them. For those religious houses, which our Ancesters had built for such Godly and vertuous people, who (forsaking both father, mother, all their kinne and acquaintance, and flying from all the pleasures and preferments, which this transitorie world could yeeld them) gaue themselves wholly to the holy exercises of humility, chastity, pouerty, and all sortes of mortification: these Monasteries (I say) and all that professed in them a retired religious life, the Protestantes haue beaten downe and banished, and haue not in their places erected any other, for the singular Godly men or women of their religion; Which doth most evidently argue, that there is in them small Zeale, and rare practise, of any such extraordinary piety and deuotion. Surely it must needes be a strange Christian congregation, that boldeth them for no tollerable members of their common weale, whome Christ specially chooseth to serue him day and night; and by whose holy example and most feruent prayers, all other Christians doe find themselves much edified, and mightily protected. So that brieftly, whether you consider the persons that serue God; or the place where he is serued; or the manner of his diuine seruice, the Catholike religion doth in every point surpass the Protestant by many degrees. Thus much in answer vnto Master PERKINS objection of

Atheisme against vs, the which I esteemed fittest for this Preface,

being a matter of so great moment, and therefore most worthy

to be examined and considered of a part, with mature

judgement. Nowe to the rest of his que-

stions, according to his owne

order.



THE REALL PRESENCE

OVR CONSENTS.

M. PERKINS Page 185

We hold and beleene a presence of Christes body and bloud in the Sacrament of the Lordes Supper; and that no fained; but a true; and

HITHERTO we agree in wordes, but in sense nothing at all. For he frameth a strange construction of that real presence: which (saith he) must be considered two waies. First, in respect of the *signe*; Secondly, in respect of the *communicants*. The *signe* he drinke and wine, with which Christes body and bloud be present, not in respect of place and consistencie, but in sacramental relation; that is, when the sacramentall signes of bread and wine are present to the hand, they doe present to the minde of the receiver, the body and bloud of Christ. So that already M. Perkins is fained, (true a call, presence, is shrunken into a sacramentall relation, and only significative presence; such as may well be of thinges as farre distant the one from the other: as the cope of heaven is from the center of the earth: a strange real presence surely. The second kinde of presence (saith he) is in respect of the *communicants*. to whose believing hearts he is formally present. If you aske whether this be not as odde a kinde of presence as the other was? he answereth by going about the bush: saying, that such as the communion is, such is the presence: as by the communion you must judge a faine presence. Ignorant (as they say) per Ignorant. He might shortly have said (if he had meant plaine dealing) that by your faith you must mount into heaven, and take hold on Christ sitting at the right hand of his Father; and from thence drawe his righteousnesse, and convey it to your selfe so that both sides of his true real presence, is made without any nearer meeting of the parties, then heaven and earth doe meete together. But let vs give him the hearing: this real communion is made on this manner. God the Father giueth Christ in this Sacrament as really and truly, as any thing can be giuen to man, and that non preeminently, but whole Christ; yet, not the substance of the God-head, but the efficacy, merits, and operation are conveyed abence to the man-hood: but the whole must be, both in respect

of substance, as of merits and benefits, is giuen wholly and jointly together. And when God so giueth Christ, he giueth withall at the same time the Spirit of Christ; which createth in the hart of the receiuer the instrument of true faith; by which the hart doth really receiue Christ, by resting vpon the promise which God hath made, that he will giue Christ and his right conuersion vnto euery true beleauer. Nowe then, when God giueth Christ and his benefits, and man by faith receiueth the same; there riseth an vnion betwene them, not forged but reall, and so neare, that none can be nearer: and being a reall vnion, there is a reall communion, and consequently, a reall presence of Christ to the hart of him that receiueth the Sacrament in faith. And thus saue (suchlike) doe we confesse with the Romish Church.

It may well be that you agree herein with the Romish Church; that is, with some apish counterfeit of the Roman; but the true Roman Church condemneth all that phantastical kinde of receiuing, as you your selfe declare in the wordes following. But before we come vnto them, let vs note by the way some strange points (of doctrine shall I say) or rather dreaming of our conceited Masters the Protestants. Who euer yet heard in true diuinitie, that the God-head considered apart by it selfe had merits to conuiey to the man-hood, as M. P. R. here teacheth; for merits belong to an inferior in respect of his superiority of whome he meriteth; now the God-head is not inferior to any, as all but *Arians* confesse. Again, howe can whole Christ be giuen to man, as M. P. R. first affirmeth, if the substance of the God-head be not giuen, as presently after he declareth for the substance of the God-head is the principall part of Christ, who is both God & man. Moreover, how is Christs substance as well as his benefits, made ours; or really present to our faith; if we be made partakers only of his righteousness, which may (as euery man knoweth) well be, without any bodily presence of him; besides, that fiction of his, that faith is created in our hart, at the same instant that we receiue the Sacrament, is very absurd. For (as all the world witnesseth) a man must be induced with faith, before he goe to receiue that Sacrament; for vntill he presenteth himselfe most unworthily vnto that holy table. Lastly, if simple men & silly women should receiue this Sacrament, vntill they vnderstand M. P. R. doctrine of sacramental regeneration, of his word and commandment made by special faith in it (as a man should receiue, before he knoweth what and howe he is to receiue) then surely they should neuer receiue it, the manner of it is so intricate, and so farre passing their capacity. I may not omit here, that which I clipped off in M. P. R. discourse, to make it the more perspicuous: to wit, that Christs benefits are bestowed on us partly by Gods imputation only; vpon others they are bestowed by a kind of propagation, which M. P. R. cannot expresse fully, but doth resemble to thus: A new candle is lighted by another, and so the light of one

one it could be vnder twenty candles: even so the inherēt righteousness of every beleuer is deriued from the store-house of righteousness, which is the manhood of Christ: this (I say) I could not but let the gentle reader vnderstand, that he may consider howe slippery & vnconstant the man is in his owne doctrine. In the question of justification, it is high treason to confesse any inherēt righteousness in vs. For (as he there saith) it doth raise the very foundation of religion: there only he alloweth of a certaine strange reall imputation of Christes iustice vnto vs; but here (hauing belike forgotten that euer he said any such word) he teacheth besides that imputative, an inherēt righteousness to be couied from Christ into every righteous mans soule. With whom will this man agree (trowe you) that cannot agree with himselfe? Let vs now come vnto the maine point of our dissent, which M. PERKINS deliuereth thus: we differ not touching the presence it selfe, but only in the manner of presence. For though we hold a reall presence of Christes body and blood in the Sacrament: yet, we doe not take it to be locall, bodily, or substantiall, but spiri-
tually and mysticall: first to the signes, by fact and not all relation; then to the communicants, by faith alone. On the contrary, the Church of Rome maintaineth a locall, bodily, and substantiall presence of Christes body and blood, by a change and transubstantiation of the bread and wine into the said body and blood, which they beleue to be wrought by the vertue of Christes wordes, pronounced ouer the bread and wine, by a lawfull Priest, intending to doe that, which Christ at his last supper instituted and commanded him to doe.

Master PERKINS reasons to the contrary be these:

This corporall presence ouerturneth sundry articles of faith. For we beleue that the body of Christ was made of the pure substance of the Virgin Mary, and that but once: namely, when it was conceived by the holy Ghost. But this cannot stand, if the body of Christ be made of bread, vlesse we beleue contraries: that the body was made of the Virgin, and not of the Virgin; made once, and not once; but often.

We read not in our Creede, made of the Virgin Mary, but borne of her; now there is great difference betweene made and borne. For a house is made, of a Carpenter, but is not borne of him; but the vvord made (vvhich may also in good sence be vsed) being fitter to cloake the fallacy, Master PERKINS cared not to straine a little curtisie vvith the articles of our beleefe, and to thrust in made, in stead of borne. But let this prery iugling-tricke passe; and to his argument I answer, that the appearance of this contrariety, proceedeth either out of meere ignorance of our doctrine, or else out of the equiuocation of this vvord made. For we hold, that Christes blessed body is but once made, if made be taken for to be fashioned and formed newe from the beginning: so was it but once made of the pure blood of the immaculate Virgin Mary; but may be againe and

againewell made present, vnder this or that forme, or on this or that altar; which hath no shadowe of contrariety with the other. For euery mans body which is but once made in his mothers vombe, may afterward a thousand times be made present, in one or diuers places. Nowe when we say with the ancient Fathers, that *of bread is made the body of Christ*; the sense is, that the substance of bread is turned into the body of Christ: so that then there is no more the substance of bread vnder the formes of bread, but Christes body which succeedeth in place of it; & therefore the bread is said to be turned vnto Christes body, and Christes body to be made of bread: not that any part of the bread remaineth changed into Christes body, for that Christes body is a newe created and framed; but because that by that very action (wherewith the bread is remoued out the body is brought into that place) the one is said to be made of the other: so that here is nothing contrary vnto that article of our beleefe: borne of the Virgin Mary.

No more is there vnto that other specified by M. PERKINS, *he ascended into heauen; and from thence shall come to iudge, &c.* for albeit he ascended the fortieth day after his resurrection, and shall at the last day come from thence to iudgement: yet, betweene those two daies he may be where he will, and wherefoeuer else he be, it hath no direct repugnance with either branch of that article: and therefore, it doth but bewray the insufficiency of the Protestants skill in the rules of opposition or repugnances; who so confidently asserre such great contrariety to be, where there is none at all.

Tract. 50. But Augustine saith, that Christ according vnto his Majestie, prouidentie & grace, in Ioanm. is present with vs to the end of the world; but according vnto his assumed flesh, be Lib. 9. in is not alwaies with vs: the same doth also Cyril, Fulgentius, and Vigilius Ioanmem. testifie.

Lib. 2. ad We answere: that Christ (in deede) according vnto that visible forme *Thras.* of a man; in which he once liued here vvith his Disciples, hath very seldom beene seene vpon earth since his ascension, but according vnto that *Cont. Eutich. lib. 1.* forme of assumed flesh, sitteth on the right hand of his Father: which answere I take out of Vigilius cited here by M. PERKINS. For he saith, that Christ

cap. 4. is departed from vs in the forme of a seruant: that is: according vnto his naturall shape of man; but may neuerthelesse be very well with vs, vnder the formes of bread and wine in the Sacrament, which S. Augustine insinuateth in the very treatise alleaged by M. PERKINS, saying: *that Christ is now with vs in foure sortes; by faith, by the signe of the Crosse, by Baptisme, and by the Eucharist*: where making his manner of being with vs in the Eucharist, distinct from his presence both by faith, signe, and grace, doth shewe it to be a reall bodily presence; which he teacheth most plainly vpon these wordes

wordes of the Psalmie, adore his footes: *Psal. 98.* concluding thereon, that the same flesh which our Saviour tooke of the blessed Virgin Mary, was then, and is now to be adored in the Sacrament: therefore (notwithstanding his being in heaven in forme of man) he assuredly believed his naturall body to be really present in the Eucharist. So did S. Cyril another of M. P. E. R. authours, *Libr. 12. cap. 31.* who vpon S. Iohn auoucheth, Christ (by his flesh received in the Eucharist) to sanctifie the soules and bodies of all communicants, and to be wholly in every one of them; to vvhome I will joyne their equall S. Gregory of Nisse: who saith, *Orat. de Paschate.* like as the God-head doth fill the vvhole vvhorld: even so consecration is made in very many places, and yet is it but one body; so that by these worthy writers judgements; Christes ascension to heaven, doth not any whit hinder the reall presence of his body in the holy Sacrament. And to dispatch here together that which M. P. E. R. repeateth againe and againe, that a true body cannot be in two places at once: we plainly hold with the holy Fathers, that one and the same body, may (by the omnipotent power of God) be in as many places at once, as it shall please him to set it. That this hath no repugnance vvith true Philosophy, shall be proued in the next argument.

And here by the warrant of Gods word I will proue, that Christes body *de facto*, hath beene in two places at once. That since the ascension it sitteth at the right hand of God in heaven, both we and they confesse; but longe after his ascension, he appeared bodily vnto S. Paul as he went towards Damascus: ergo, his body hath beene in two places at once. Calvin turneth himselfe on both sides, & seeketh all possible meanes to thist from the euidence of this place, saying first: that it was some voice only heard from beauen by S. Paul, as at Christes baptisme; but Christ was not there really. This is laid most manifestly against the plainetext: God ordained that thou shouldst see the just one; and heare a voice out of his owne mouth; therefore he vv as really present; and Christ saith, to this end I appeared vnto thee. And S. Paul himselfe vvitnesseth, that he had scene Christ after his resurrection, euen as the other Apostles had done, which was in bodily presence: & in the same chap. S. Paul demanded of him that appeared, who art thou Lord? and he answered, I am Iesus: was not he then present? What can be more plainly set downe, or is more often repeated in the very text of Scripture? yet, the blind obstinacy of Calvin was such, that not being able to defend but that Christ appeared, turneth himselfe the other way, and had rather say that S. Pauls eye-sight was so much strengthened and made so sharpe, that it pierced through the heavens, and did see Christ sitting there on the right hand of his Father; and so Christ did not descend, or was scene out of heaven, but S. Pauls sight mounted vp thether.

20. Inq. 23. *Repl.* This doctrine is first repugnant to himselfe, who I scoffeth at
 3. *Instit.* vs for maintayning that the Saints in heaven can heare our prayers, and
 20. §. 24. *asketh* howe they can haue so long eares, and so sharpe eyes, as to beare and see
 so farre off: vvhich here notwithstanding hee attributeth vnto a poore
 earthly creature, nothing comparable to the Saints in heaven. But be-
 sides that contradiction, this his answer, is much more absurde then
 the other. For vvhome he imagineth to be so Eagle-eyed, that he could
 see into heaven; the text vvithnesse to be strooke starke blinde, and not
 able to see the broad high vvay before him. Again, if that vision had
 beenethrough the vertue of S. Pauls sight, his companions should not
 haue bene partakers of it: but they did both see the light and also heard
 the voice, though not so distinctly as to understand it. Further, there
 passed many speeches betwene them: *Who art thou Lord? What wilt
 thou haue mee to doe?* &c. vvhich doth conuince a sensible and bodily
 presence. Lastly, it is said directly, *that Christ appeared vnto S. Paul
 in the way*: not that he had seene him in heauen; so that nothing can be
 more certaine euen by the euidence of Gods vvord, then that Christes
 body hath bene in two places at once; as vvell may it be in two thou-
 sand, or in as many more as it shall please God to employ it: for there
 is no greater repugnance in reason for being in many places, then for
 S. Christs being in two at once. And as you haue heard before, that S. Augu-
 s. Ambrosius, and S. Cyrill taught him to be bodily present in as many places,
 Primasius as the blessed Sacrament is administred: so doe the ancient Expositors
 in cap. 10. of the Epistle to the Hebrewes affirme, that Christes body is offered now on
 many Altars at the same very moment. And to cite one of their sentences
 Lib. 3. de *ut large*: S. Chrysostome cryeth out: O miracle! O goodnesse of God! he
 sacrificer: *thus stande alone with his Father; at the very same instant of time, is touched
 by the hands of all; and doth offer and deliuer himselfe to them, who are wil-
 ling to receaue him!* and Helias left his cloake to his disciple Heliseus: but
 his populū Christ ascending, left his flesh: Helias (in deede) cast his cloake off: but
 his flesh. Christ hath left his flesh to vs, and ascending took it up with himselfe. By
 this you see howe farre this most holy and learned Father vvias from
 arguing as our Protestants are wont to doe: his body is ascended, there-
 fore it cannot be in the Sacrament. Nay (saith he) most expressly, it
 is both there; and here together: through Christes power and loue to-
 wardes vs.

Master PARKINS second reason. This bodily presence ouerturneth the
 nature of a true body, whose essentiall propriety it is, to haue length, breadth,
 and thickenesse: and by reason of these three dimensions, a body can occupy but one
 place at once, as Aristotle said, the propriety of a bodys is to be seated in some
 place.

Quest. they therefore that say the body of Christ is in many places at once, doe make it no body at all.

Answer. We graunt it to be the intrinsecall nature of a body, to haue length, breadth, and thicknesse; so that no body can possibly be without those dimensions: but we denie it to be essentiall vnto a body, to be seated in some place. For quantity and vbi, be two distinct predicaments, as the learned knowe; quantity being perfect in his owne nature, without any relation to the place: for quantity hath an absolute and no respectiue essence. True it is, that a body is by nature fit and apt to be seated in a place, which is that that Aristotle teacheth of it. As a man naturally is apt to bee learned; yet, actually to bee learned, is a meere accident to man, and manie men be without it: even so to be actually seated in a place, is altogether without the nature of a body; in so much as the greatest body of all others (to wit) the highest heauen, is without a place; there being no body without it, whose extremity may enuiron and compasse in that heauen being the highest body; as the nature of a place requireth: so that it belongeth not to the essence and nature of a body, actually to be in any place; and consequently, whether it be in a place, or not in any place; whether it be in one place or in many places, the body remaineth still a true perfect body, accomplished with all his substantiall partes. Again, our faith teacheth vs, that the naturall subsistence and person of a man (which is much nearer to the nature of man, then his seating in a place) can be separated from man leaving his whole nature entire and perfect, as it is in Christ our Saviour, where the full complete nature of man, is without his owne naturall subsistence and person; he being ingastred and taken into the person of God. How much more easily then, may his blessed body be without occupying any place, which is farre more extrinsecall to him: And touching the taking vp of as great a place, as the bignesse of the body requireth, we hold vpon the same groundes: that it is of no such necessity: but that the power of God can dispence with it. For if a body may be in no place at all, it may be in as little a roome as it shall please God to enbise it: Which our Saviour also very plainly teacheth: when he signifieth that it is possible to God, for to passe a Camel through the eye of a needle. And Christ himselfe entering into the house, where his Disciples were assembled, the doore being shutt, gaue vs a manifest experiment, that a true naturall body needeth no space at all to be seated in; but may (by diuine power) passe through other solide bodies: so that it remaineth euident to them that haue skill in Philosophie, that

Mat. 19.
vers. 26.
Job. 20.
vers. 26.

that there is no such repugnance in a true naturall body, but that it may be in many places at once; or in as litle a place as it shall please God to bestow it: And when any of the ancient Fathers say, that bodies must needs haue places proportionable to them; they meane, that according vnto the ordinary course of nature, so it must be: yet they doe not demie, but that God can otherwise dispose of them.

M. PARKINS third reason: *Transubstantiation ouerthroweth the very supper of the Lord: For in euery Sacrament there must be a signe, a thing signified, and a proportion betwene them both. Good, let it be remembred: but the Catholikes reall presence taketh all away. For when the bread is really turned into the body of Christ, then the signe is abolished, and there remaineth nothing but the outward formes of bread and wine.*

Answer. Not so: for there is also the body and blood of Christ as we hold, and so at the most there is nothing gone but the signe only; as he tearmeth the bread: but neither is that taken away, and then all remaineth whole. For not the substance of bread and wine, but the outward formes of them, are the signe of the Sacrament. For they alone doe no lesse represent vnto our minde and vnderstanding, the spiritual feeding of our soules by Christes body, then if they had the substance of bread vnder them: as

Mat. 2. the similitude of fiery tongues, without the true substance of tongues, did sufficiently signify the gift of tongues, bestowed vpon the Apostles at the feast of Pentecost.

Math. 3. And it is not necessary to believe, that the *Doue* which descended vpon our Saviour at his baptism, was a true naturall Pigeon: but the outward shape of *Doue*, was sufficient to expresse those *Doue*-like qualities which were in our Saviour: so the outward shewe of bread and wine, although the substance be absent, serueth very conueniently to make vs remember and vnderstand, that euen then when we receiue the blessed Sacrament, our soules are as spiritually fedde with it, as our bodies are wont to be with bread and wine; or which is signified secondarily, that as bread is made of many graines of corne, vniued and compact into one masse and body; euen so all vve Christians by receiuing the Sacrament worthily, and by the spirit of Christ dwelling in vs, are made one mysticall body of Christ; and should therefore one loue and render the good of another, as members of the same body are wont to doe: All this (I say) the outward forme and shewe of bread only, doth as vvell present vnto our mindes, as if the substance of bread were ehere present with it.

Answer. (saith **M. PARK.**) it abolisheth the endes of the Sacrament: First, it maketh vs amiss remember Christ: who being present bodily in the Sacrament needeth not be remembered, because helpe of remembrance are of things absent.

Answer. A man would thinke (were not his wits some what dis tempered) that

that he might be remembered best, that is most present to vs: neither is remembrance only of things absent. For as euery one may well remember, when they see one whome they haue seldome scene before, the very sight of him, or his speech, or some other token which he telleth, calleth vs to remembrance of him, who is personally then present. But if this were not so: yet, were the end of the Sacrament accomplished most perfectly. For by Christes reall presence in the Sacrament, we are admonished to remember, not his body barely, but his death on the Crosse (as S. Paul expoundeth it) which death of his is absent: and by the consecrating of his body apart from his blood, and by the elevation of it, is represented vnto vs very liuely; and so we are put in minde and made to remember a thing absent, to wit: the death and passion of Christ.

1. Cor. 11.

Moreover, M. P. saith, that another end of the Sacrament is, to feed the soule with eternall life: but by transubstantiation the principall feeding is of the body, and not of the soule, which is only fed with spirituall food.

Answer. Alas, into what straightnes was he brought when he wrote this? a man would thinke, that if the substance of bread remained still (as in their counterfeite Sacrament it doth) it should rather be food for the body, then for the spirit. For bread (as fooles knowe as well as phisitions) doth nourish the body naturally. We then that remove the substance of bread out of the Sacrament, must needs therefore meane to feed only the soule thereby, and not the body at all. For Christes blessed body received in the Sacrament, is nurrature only of our soule, by his graces bountifully bestowed vpon the worthy receiuer; it giueth to the body only, a certaine feede or pledge of immortallity, according vnto that: *He that eateth my flesh, &c. hath life euertlasting, and I will raise him vp in the last day.*

Job. 6.
vers. 54.

10. M. P. PERKINS fourth reason. In the Sacrament the body of Christ is receiued, as it was crucified, and his blood as it was shed vpon the crosse, but now the act of crucifying is past, it is faith alone, that maketh Christ crucified to be present vnto vs in the Sacrament. ergo.

Answer. We denie his first proposition: for we receiue the same body that was crucified, but not after that bloody manner, as it was there vsed, but vnder the formes of bread and wine, which Christes owne vvordes doe importe: *take this, this is my body, that shall be giuen for you: he that shall be giuen for you; that is not in the same manner, though it be the same in substance. Yet (as I once said before) the consecration of his blood in the Chalice, as it were a part from his body, and powdered out with the lifting vp of the body after consecration (as it is done in the Masse) with the breaking and receiuing of the holy Host, doth liuely represent vnto the faithfull, Christes blessed death and passion. But what*

resemblance hath the eating of bread, & drinking of wine (the Protestants holy communion) with the crucifying of Christ: Is eating and drinking of so pleasing food, meete to expresse Christes drinking of gall and most painefull torments: by their feeling faith, they would salve this, but they cannot. For besides faith, there must be (as M. PER. himselfe before confessed) a proportion betwene the signe and the thing signified: but there is no proportion betwene eating of fine bread, & drinking of good wine, with the dolorous crosse of Christ. Seeing then, that in the Sacrament (as M. PER. teacheth) Christes body must be received, as it was crucified, he must needs appointe something else then bread & wine, to be the signes of this Sacrament: for they be most vnproper to represent Christes passion.

Againe (saith he, discounting very shamefully) That blood which came out of Christes side was not gathered vp againe: nay, the blood did so if it were allasse, because after the resurrection, he lived no more a naturall, but a spiritual life.

Ans. Here is a proper peece of divinity. He might as well say (if his reason were good) that Christes body is not risen againe, because a body also, is a needles vnroo spiritual life. The truth is, that the body with the blood in the vaines of it, is risen againe: else were it no true resurrection, which is only when the very same body remaineth, with all the same parts and parcels of it, which it had before, be restored vnto their former essence & integrity. Not by the way, the admirable false verue of the Protestants fault, is so proper to them (saith M. PER.) to give a being vnto things, which are not. What being good Sir, can any thing should be extant in the world, which before was not? yet many, that that blood should be received spiritually,

which is not at all True (perhaps) in the Protestants vaine imagination: but (indeed) most ridiculous, to imagine that that can be received either corporally or spiritually, which is not extant nor hath any being at all. For nothing can be of it selfe, before it can be received of another.

1. Cor. 10. M. PER. here reasoneth. The fathers of the old Church did use the same spiritual meate, and drinke the same spiritual drinke, for they drinke of the rocke which was Christ: but they could not see his body which was not then crucified, but by faith: the Papists answer, that the fathers did not the same meate as we eat of today: and yet that which we eat, that is all the Israelites did eat of some spirituall food of Manna, and did drinke all of the water which issued out of the spirituall Rocke, one of them as well as another: yee, they had not the same Sacraments, that we Christians haue, neither did they receive the same grace woe doe. But M. PER. will proue that they had: because (saith he) the Apostles intent is, to proue that the Jewes were very wayward to the Corinthians, and to nothing to stirre them up.

Repl. S. Paul meant and intended nothing lesse: but in the same his

Epistle,

Epistle, and in many of the rest, expressly teacheth the state of the Christians (such as the *Corinthians* were) to surpasse farre the state of the *Leues*. For the old Testament is compared to the letter that killeth, and therefore called the ministration of damnation: the newe, to the spirit that quicketh, and to the ministry of iustice: and the old Testament did ingender to bondage, the newe to liberty. And there they were as seruants, we as brethren; they serving vnder the weak and floure elements of this world, we hauing the spirit of sonnes, &c. *2. Cor. 3. & 9* And the *Leue* had a shadowe of the thinges to come, not the very image, as we haue. *Hebr. 10. vers. 1.* so that nothing could be further from the Apostles meaning, then to make the *Leues* equall in Sacraments and graces, with the *Corinthians* who were Christians. But his intencion was (as may be easily seene by that which goeth before and followeth) to warne the *Corinthians* to chastice their bodies, as he himselfe did. (as he saith in the end of the Chapter going before) and to flie from all vice; and not to rely only vpon the extraordinary gifts of God bestowed vpon them. For (saith he) the ancient *Israelites* all, were partakers of many singular fauours of God: *1. 4. of the eating of Manna of drinking of the Rocke, &c.* And yet, because many of them committed fornication and liued wickedly, God was not pleased with all of them. Obserue also, that not one thing there mentioned by the Apostle was a Sacrament among the *Leues*, and therefore are they vnlawfully compared with our Sacraments. For a Sacrament is a set ceremony to be vsed ordinarily in the worship of God: but their passing through the red Sea was but once, therefore no set ceremony: their eating of *Manna*, and drinking of the *Rocke*, were but naturall refreshments to them; yea, their cattle did drinke of the *Rocke* as well as their Masters: which thinges, though they did prefigure our Sacraments; yet, were no Sacraments at all, and much less any thing in vertue comparable to our Sacraments.

much less any thing in vertue comparable to our Saviour.

Mr. BARNS first reason. *The Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath: so it may be said, that the Sacrament was made for man, and not man for the Sacrament; and therefore man is more excellent then the Sacrament, the end being alwaies better then the thing ordained to the end: but if Christ be truly in the Sacrament, then, not man, more excellent then it.* Argo.

1. *That the Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath, is well proved, that the Sonne of God*

Ans. By the like argument you may as well proue that the Some of God is not, nor ever shall be incarnate for the redemption of man: or els (which is most absurd) that man is better then God, because for vs men, & for our salvation, Christ descended from heauen, & was borne of the V. Mary. The end then, beinge aboue better then the thinge ordained to the end (as M. P. argueth) either Christ is not yet borne to redeme man, or els man is better then Christ. See what goodly arguments they vse, to deceiue the simple withall! the direct answer is, that the maine & principall end of Christs incarnation, passion, and

and reall presence in the Sacrament, is the glory of Gods justice, wisdom, and goodnesse, and of his owne mercy and bounty, which are more excellent then Christes incarnation and reall presence: mans redemption, spirituall feeding and saluation, are but secondary endes, which are farre inferior vnto our most louing redeemers mercy, kindnesse, and charity, through which he hath procured it.

M. PER. confirmeth this reason with that which is nothing like it, saying: *Every beleeuer in the supper of the Lord, receiveth whole Christ God & man, though not the God-head* (vvhich wordes imply a manifest contradiction. For howe can God, or whole Christ be receiued, without the God-head) *but by carnall eating we receive not wholly Christ, but only a part of the man-head: and therefore in the Sacrament there is not carnall eating: nor reall presence.*

Answ. We *Catholike* doe eate al Christes body wholly. For we part not his body, but beleeue that it is whole in every consecrated Host. Moreouer, because his blessed body is a perfect liuing body, we knowe also that it hath blood in it, as other bodies haue; and is (yet further) joyned vvith his most holy soule: and so in receiuing his body, we receiue all his man-hood both body & soule. Ouer and besides, his God-head being lincked and joyned inseperably with his man-hood, whole Christ both God and man is alwaies receiued together; so that every lay *Catholike* communicating but vnder one kind, doth receiue Christs body & blood: yea wholly, both all his man-hood and God-head: whereas, in the *Protestants* naturall communion of bread and wine, there is (in deed) neither body nor blood, not any peece of Christ, but only in their owne phantasticall imagination, so that those their ordinary out-cries are most fond: *The Papistes robbe you of the blood, being one part of the Sacrament*: Whereas *Catholike* Pastors giue to their flocke vnder one kinde, both the body and blood; yea, the very soule and God-head of Christ, as you haue heard. But the *Protestants* are the great Theories in deede, vvho defraude their vnhappy followers of both body and blood, and giue them only sacramental signes and relations, to feede their foolish phantasies.

Before I come vnto M. PER. last reason taken from authority, I thinke it fittest to place here certaine other objections, which out of place he hudleth vp together, in the answer vnto our second argument, where he saith: *first, that Christes body could not be receiued in bodily manner, before his passion.*

We say contrarily, that it could be as well before, as after. When he goeth about to proue his position, he shall be answered.

Secondly, *That Christ was the Minister of this Sacrament, and therefore if he had conueried bread into his body, he should haue taken his owne body into his handes: vvich we graunt, following S. Augustine vpon these vvordes:*

Ho

He was carried in his owne bandes. How this may be understood (saith he) of David literally, we finde not; but we finde it in Christ: for Christ was carried in his owne bandes; when delivering his owne body, he said: this is my body. For then he carried that his body in his owne bandes.

M. PAR. addeth yet further, that it should also followe that Christ did eat his owne flesh: for he did communicate also (saith he) to consecrate his last supper in his owne person. This may be true, though it have no warrant in the word. For St. Hierome a holy and most learned Doctor, doth assure me, saying: *Epistol. ad Hedibian quest. 2.* our Lord Iesus is both the guest and the banquet; he who doth eat, and is eaten: and no greater inconvenience is this in our opinion, then in theirs. For who more meete to receive Christes blessed body, then himselfe: and ywhat more foolish, then for Christ by faith to apply himselfe and his benefits, vnto himselfe: which (as you haue heard before out of M. PARKINS) is to receive the Lordes supper like a good Priest.

Lastly he saith, that if we eat Christes body really, we must needs be man-slayers: but he forgotte to proue it, *id est* to abide. If other prooffe sayled him, he might haue fledde vnto the rusty opinion of the old faine Gopermaier, which is mentioned in the Gospell itselfe. For they (as St. Augustine expoundeth it) thought that Christ would cut his flesh in pecces, as butchers doe beefe in the thambles, and either rawe or roasted, haue giuen it to be eaten, to some a legge, to other an arme, &c. But we Carbolikes doe eat Christes body whole, and that without any detriment or diminution vnto that blessed body, which is not extended vnder the partes of the sacred Host, so as one part of his body is vnder one part of it, and another part vnder another: but is after the manner of our soule in the body, the whole body vnder the whole Host, and the whole vnder eury part of the Host; and so without any parting or deuiding of his body, is wholly received of eury communicant, and remaineth after whole in their bodies, imparting his grace to their soules, so long as the formes of bread tary in their stomackes in their proper shapes; and afterward ceaseth to be there any longer: which is confirmed by those diuine wordes of the glorious Apostle St. Ambrose, recorded by his most deare Disciples: *Lib. de pass. eius.* *When he was crucified, he was crucified for the people, he was crucified for the whole world, and for the whole church. Thus which he pecceth away of the necessity which we are brought vnto by our doctrine, to hold that our bodies be nourished by naked quiddities, which (saith he) is contrary to Philosophy, is not worth the answering. For neither are we driven to hold that, vntill it be out of the bounty of our owne good willes. For it is nothing materiall to the real presence, whether our bodies be nourished by the accidents that be present or no: neither is it so cleare a case in Philosophy, whether it doo*

(that are naked qualities) doe nourish or no; as they, who haue studied Philosophie knowe. And lastly, all matters of faith are aboue the rules of Philosophie: vvhetherfore the reall presence of Christs blessed body in the Sacrament, being a memoriall and monument of all his merueilous works; it must not be thought strange, if there followe of it, many things aboue the reach of naturall Philosophie; and yet not so many (perhaps) as must needes be granted by them, as well as by vs, in the resurrection of our bodies; vvhich (notwithstanding those difficulties in Philosophie) all Christian men doe firmly beleue.

Nowe let vs come vnto such authorities as M. P. addiceth in fauour of their part, which neither are many, nor taken out of the more famous fathers of either Greek or Latin Church; and which is most admirable; nor out of the authors by him cited; but that in the very same wordes which he alleadgeth to disproue the reall presence, they doe evidently auerre and prooue: so well knowne and confessed a truth was this of the blessed

Dialog. 1. Sacrament in all antiquity. *Theophrastus* saith, *Thes same Christ*, who called himselfe all body, bread and wine, who called himselfe a vine, he vouchsafed the visible sign, the name of his true body, with changing nature, but putting grace to nature. Here are scarce two wordes together, as it is in the author. The former part of his wordes be: *Christ* changed nature, giuing to his body, the outward sign, and to the sign, the name of his body, *that is*; he called his body bread, and bread his body; so that there is a twofold for vs, against vs; and the last part of the sentence is *body* (for vs) *blest Christ* would (saide he) haue shew that he partaken of the mysteries, as he attend vnto the nature of the thinges which are seen (that is bread and wine) but by reason of the changing of names, to giue vnderstand that thing, which is made by grace, that is: they heare in consolation that which was before bread and wine, to be changed into his body and blood, so he beleue that they also bread and wine, were changed and made his body and blood; that change being wrought by the virtue and grace of his word. To these wordes of *Theophrastus* in his first *Dialog*; he joyneth other wordes of his taken out of his *Second*, yet quessing the same *Dialog*. *The mystical sign* after consecration is seen, their nature, first is premitt in their first nature, figure and forme, vnder which figure and forme it is seen. Here M. B. should haue stopped in the middle of the sentence, as they are sometimes accustomed to doe, and then had he left some shew of mortall for his part; yet, such a might easily be understood; but vvhich the reason of the remaining of my sicall figures in their forme nature and figure, is (as he himselfe declareth) that *body* and *be* seen as before, he doth giue the learned reader to vnderstand, that he speaketh not of the inward substance of them, but of the outward

outward appearance, which is the proper object of the senses which our
ward accident, hath a certaine kind of essence and nature, as well as the
substance it selfe. But that which followeth in *Theodore* putteth al out of
doubt. For he addeth: *The mysticall signes may be seene as before: but this*
which they are made, is vnderstood: And what is it vnderstood to be made?
Marry, euen that which we beholde and adore: which can be no other thing,
but the true reall body, of Christ Jesus God and man. For in hand doe we
beleeue, and him doe we adore. Seethen, haue this his first and best au-
thour, disproyeth plainly his owne position. *M. P. 1.* second authour is
one *Gelasius*, an old writer I confesse, but where or whate he was, it is vn-
certaine. This man saith: *Bread and wine passe into the substance of the body*
and blood of Christ; yet they cease not, but remaine still in the property of their owne
nature: these wordes be flat against *M. P. 1.* and the *Zwinglians* doctrine, in
that they teach *bread and wine* to passe into the substance of Christes body. The
other clasp seetheth to make for the *Lutherans*: yet, may be interpreted,
that they remained stil in some property of their nature, that is: in the same
forme, colour, and taste, as they did before. *M. P. 1.* goeth on: *Lamb and*
saith, if he be asked what conversion this is, whether formal or substantiall, or of sent. dist.
any other kinde, he cannot define it.

II.

Ans. Gentle reader turne to the place, and embrace his resolution. For
most formally, doeh he deliuer our doctrine, and that proued by the te-
stimony of the ancient Fathers: albeit, the name of transubstantion were
not then in vse.

1. From the Fathers sentences, *M. P. 1.* falleth to collections of his owne,
out of them. *First* (saith he) *they used in former times to burne with fire, that*
which remained after the administration of the Lords supper, and thereforeooke it
not for his body: and quoth for prouofe of this R. Bishop, where he sheweth
either ouer great boldnes, if he did not see the plate, an exceeding wilfull
mallice, if he read it. For that ancient writer (but of that ceremony of bur-
ning al that was left of the Pascale lamb) doeth rather the cleane contrary,
to wit: that if we cannot vnderstand howe these things, y which we see are
turned into our Lords body (into which my story phisicall) (saith he) with
the R. Bishop, to seeke a more plaine) then must we be content to see of the body Christ,
the R. Bishop, by perswading our selves, that as he possibill vnder the veile of the ho-
ly Ghost, which seemeth to us impossible. See vnder first that word by without
speeche of . . . And in the sixe booke and two and twenty Chapter of the
same worke, he speaketh yet more plainly saying, a That he respecteth
ignorantly, who knoweth not the vertue and dignitie of this Sacrament, and who
pretendeth that it is the body and blood of Christ, not that, so that old R. Bishop con-
demneth them of ignorance for not beleeuing Christes body to be truly

III

in the Sacrament. Secondly (saith M. PARKER) by the sacramental union of the bread of wine, with the body and blood of Christ they used to confirme the personall union of this man, head of Christ with the God-head, against heretikes. Let vs admit this to be true: for then it followeth necessarily against himselfe, that the true body of Christ, is really present in the blessed Sacrament, as his true

Dialog. 2. God-head and man-hood, were really vnited in one person. But if *Theodoret* (whome he quoteth) be well read, you shall finde, that they against whome he writeth; objected this common doctrine of the Church (that bread is turned into the body of Christ) to proue, that the man-hood of Christ was turned into the God-head; and consequently, that there were not two natures in Christ, but one. And albeit the consequent was *Heretike*; yet the antecedent was *Catholike*, good, and not denyed of *Theodoret*, but that there was a reall conversion of bread into the true body of Christ: and therefore did other *Heretikes* (who denied our Saviour to haue true flesh) deny also consequently, the truth of the blessed Sacrament, as the same *Theodoret* doth witnesse out of *S. Irenaeus*, in these wordes. *They admit not the Eucharist and Sacrifice, because they doe not confesse the Eucharist to be the flesh of our Saviour, which was crucified for vs, and which the Father of his benignity raysed againe.*

Libr. 17. cap. 25. M. PARKER further objecteth, that *Nicephorus* reporteth, that young children were sent for from the scoole, to eat that which remayned of the Sacrament: which (saith he) was a signe, that they thought it not to be Christs body.

Not so: for he so reporteth it, that any man may see, that he beleeued it to be the very body of Christ. For first he saith, that those children were pure and incorrupt, not false from their state of Innocencie. Secondly, that they were fasting. Thirdly, he affirmeth in plain tearmes, that they receiued the immaculate body of Iesus Christ God and Man. Finally, he proueth it so to be, and that by miracle. For one of the children who had receiued that morning, being by his fathers malicious Iewe, afterwards cast into a glassiers furnace most fiery hot, and shut in there for three daies, was miraculously preserved alive, and found there without any hurt at all, by vertue of the blessed Sacrament which he had receiued. What further blindness then was this, to alledge this against the reall presence, which so admirably doth confirme it? We knowe that in certaine places, some used to giue the blessed Sacrament vnto children; yea, vnto sucking babies, being also dipped in the chalice; which rather proueth our opinion. For they thought it necessary for all that would be saved, to receiue this holy Sacrament. Nowe these infants, could haue no such act of faith (as the Protestants doctrine requireth) to make their communion: therefore,

fore, at that time they held the same kinde of reall presence which we doe, which is made by lawfull consecration of the Priest, and not by the faith of the receiuer. And that you may perceiue, that I speake not only by ghesse, take the profession of one of those authors whome M. PER. allegeth, *Anselmus* by name, who saith in the worke cited by M. PER. *Here Lib. 3. de Eccl. offic. cap. 24.* We beleeue the nature of pure bread and wine (mixed with water) to be conuer-
 ted into a nature indited with reason, to witte, into the nature of the body and blood of Christ: can any thing be more plaine against them? Finally, M. PER. collecteth out of one *Nicolas Cabasilas*, his exposition of these wordes of the Masse, *Sursum corda, lift vp your hearts: that (the people being willed by the Priest to lift vp their thoughts from the earth, and to thinke on things above) Christ is not really present with them; but only on the right hand of his Father.* To which we answer, that when those wordes were spoken, Christes body (in deed) is not there really present, for they are in the presence before the Canon and consecration: but is made present afterwarde, by the wordes of consecration. Secondly, that he might (notwithstanding those wordes were spoken after the consecration, as they be before) be there present. For being admonished to call our mindes and hearts from earthly thinges, and to lift them vp to consider heauenly: what more diuine and heauenly subject can we meditate vpon; then our Saviour *Iesus Christ* there present, and the holy mysteries of his incarnation and passion there represented, and the infinite mercies and goodnesse of God, powred out on vs through him, and by meanes of this holy Sacrifice: and thus much in effect, doth the answer vnto those wordes signifie (*We lift vp our hearts vnto our Lord*) to attend vpon him at this time specially, in these his holy mysteries. Obserue, that we are not bidden to lift vp our eyes to beholde the sunne, or to contemplate the starres in the skie, and so you may see, that the Protestants ignorance in the wordes of the holy Masse, doth little moue them or helpe their bad cause. Thus at length we are come to an end of M. PERKINS reasons against vs, nowe to those that he maketh for the Catholike party, which are both fewe in number, and very barely propounded; but by the helpe of God, I will doe my endeavour to supply his negligence therein.

The first, is taken out of these wordes of our Saviour. *The bread which I will giue, is my flesh, which I will giue for the life of the world.* Here is a plaine promise made by Christ *Iesus* (that saileth not of his word) of giuing vs his flesh to eate, and that very flesh which on the Crosse was to be giuen for the redemption of the world: these wordes be so euident, that they who heard them, made no doubt of the sense of them; but were astonished at it, and said: *How can this man giue vs his flesh to eate?*

they doubted not but that Christ had said, that he would give them his flesh to eat, his speeches were so plaine for it, but yet beleueed they not, that he could doe it. Nowe what replied Christ vnto their doubt? that he would giue them only bread to eat in remembrance of him? which would surely haue satisfied them throughly, because nothing was more easie to doe then that. But truth is not to be concealed, for feare of Pharaiseall scandall: and therefore he told them very roundly, *That unless they did eat the flesh of the sonne of man, and drinke his blood, they should not haue life in them: And he that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, hath life euerm-lasting.* And yet more expresse: *My flesh is meate in deede, and my blood drinke in deede.* How should he haue made the matter more plaine?

To this M^r P^{er}kin^s answereth, first, *That Christ speaketh of a spirituall eating by faith*: because the very point that he intendeth to proue, is, that to beleue in him, and to eat his flesh, is all one. *My flesh is meate in deede, and my blood drinke in deede.* This answer is absurd: For euen in their owne doctrine, there is a great difference betwene beleueing in Christ, and receiuing the communion: for many doe beleue in Christ when they doe not receiue the communion: receiuing *feeding* (as they teach) *is* *feeding* or confirmation of *feeding*. And to say, that Christ there maketh no difference betwene beleueing in him, and *eating of his flesh*, is flat against the text. For saying that he would hereafter giue them his flesh to eat, he doth declare, that he speaketh not of beleueing in him, which he would haue them to doe presently, and many of them did beleue in him before, who could not digest his doctrine of the Sacrament.

Again, it is altogether vnluckely, that our Sauour would haue vsed such strange offensive speeches (as the *eating of his flesh*, and *drinking of his blood*) to signifie only, that they must beleue in him: and that he seeing them so much scandalized at those his hard and vnsuall phrases, that they were ready to forsake him, would yet, not once in plaine termes interpret them, for the sauing of so many soules: wherefore, it remaineth most manifest, that by *eating of his flesh*, he meant something else, then beleueing in him. And M^r P^{er}kin^s other shift, that in all the sixe Chapter of *S. Iohn*, Christ speaketh not one word of eating his flesh in the Sacrament, is so contrary vnto the euidence of the text it selfe, and vnto the exposition of all ancient Fathers, that it deserueth no answer, especially, when neither by reason or authority, he goeth about to fortifie it. But I muse why he did omit their ordinary objection out of the same place: *The flesh profiteth nothing, it is the spirit that quickeneth.* It may be (perhaps) because he knewe that the wordes being rightly vnderstood, make more against the *Protestants* then for them. For the flesh there, must be taken either for Christes flesh,

flesh, or for our flesh: if for Christes flesh, then (saith S. Augustine) *Howe* Traß. 27.
can it be, that it proficeth nothing? where he said before: vnicles yo eat my in Ioann.
flesh, you shall haue no life in you. What therefore meant he this, it proficeth
nothing? Marry (saith he) it proficeth nothing as they vnderstood it. For they
tooke they should eate it, as it is torne and cut in peeces, being dead and sold in
the shambles; and not as it is quickned with the spirit, which he doth illustrate
with the comparison of knowledge, which being alone, doth puffe vp fr. 13m D
(scientia enim inflat), but being joyned with charity, doth edifie. Euen so 01. 13m
(saith he) when the spirit is coupled with the flesh, then dash is proficet verie fr. 13m
much, or else the worde would not haue bene made flesh, and haue dwelled a- fr. 13m
mong vs. With S. Augustine agreeth S. Cyril vpon that place, but more In cap. 6.
liberall seemeth to be the interpretation of S. Chrysostome, followed by Ioann.
Theophilact and others, vpon this place: that by the flesh, is to be vnder-
stood our fleshly and naturall reason, which in these misteries of faith,
doth rather hinder then helpe vs. For mans wit of it selfe, cannot com-
prehend howe bread may be turned into Christes body; not howe so fr. 13m D
grear a bodie can he in so litle a room, &c. but informed with faith and 11. 13m
Gods grace, it is then well assured, that whatsoeuer Christ said is true,
and that nothing is impossible to him: howe contrarie soeuer it seems
vnto flesh and blood. For, his wordes (as it followeth in the text) be
spirit and life, that is: be of diuine force, and giue life and being vnto
whom hee pleases. And thus much of our first reason: Nowe for the
second: so to say, vpon that hee said: this is my body, which hee eate and
drinke. Christ taking bread into his handes, gaue it to his Disciples, saying: this
is my body which is giuen for you: and giuing them the Chalice, said: drinke 1. Cor. 11.
ye all of this, for this is my blood of the newe Testament, which shall be shed for Math. 26
you. These our Saviours wordes are so plaine, that it was not possible in Marc. 14.
so fewe wordes to expresse more perspicuously, that it was his true natu- Luc. 22.
rall bodie, which he deliuered vnto them, it being the verie same which
was to be killed on the Crosse the morrowe after.

But Mr. Par. answereth, that they are not to be taken properly, but by a
 figure, the body there being put for a signe or scale of his bodie.
 This is a very extravagant exposition of Christes wordes,
 and such a one, as if it were admitted for current, woulde serue to
 subuert and ouerthrowe, all the articles of the Christian faith. For
 example, vwhen it is said, that the word was made flesh, the Manichees
 heresies against Christes true flesh, might be maintayned, by saying,
 that the flesh there, is put for a figure of the flesh: so might the Arians
 heresie, if vwhen Christ is called God, it were allowed them, to ex-
 pound and take it, for a signe or scale of God; and so of all other

articles of our beleefe; wherefore, there must be most apparant proof, for the drawing of Christes wordes into so strange a sence, before it be admitted of any reasonable man. But M. PER and the Protestants are so farre off, from producing any such invincible evidence for their odde interpretation, that they cannot alleadge any probable cause of it: heare, and then judge.

Genes. 17. M. PER saith first, That it is, an vsuall manner of the Lord, in speaking
vers. 10. of the Sacraments, to giue the name of the thing signified, to the signe: as circum-
Exod. 12. cision is called the covenant of God: and the next verse, the signe of the covenant;
vers. 11. and the Pasceall lambe is called the Angels passing-over, where as (in deede) it
1. Cor. 10. was but a signe of it: and the Rocke was Christ: & the passe-over was Christ.
1. Cor. 5. Answer. It may be, that sometimes speaking of Sacraments by the way,
vers. 7. some figurative speech may be used: but we say, that when any Sacrament
 is first instituted and ordained, that then the wordes are to be taken literally,
 without any such figure. For example, in the Sacraments (specified
 by M. PER.) Circumcision was commanded in these wordes: *You shall*

Genes. 17. *circumcise the flesh of your prepuce, that it may be a signe of the covenant betweene*
vers. 11. *you and me.* These be the wordes of the institution of that Sacrament, and
 not one of them but must be literally taken. For the true flesh in deede,
 was to be circumcised and cut off, and no figure of the flesh or signe of cutting,
 would serue the turne. In like manner, where the Sacrament of the

Exod. 12. Pasceall lambe is instituted, all must be vnderstood literally, as a naturall
vers. 3. lambe really killed, roasted and eaten: and not a figure, signe, or seale of it:
 when our blessed Saviour instituting a Sacrament in these wordes, *This*
is my body: the wordes must be taken literally, and not figuratiuely; and
 consequently, the reason which M. PER bringeth for him, beareth strong-
 ly against himselfe, because it is and ever hath beene Gods fashion, when

he instituteth Sacraments, to institute them in their proper termes, which
 must be taken literally, as by his owne examples hath bin proued: Nowe
 to his sentences: *Circumcision is both a covenant, and the signe of a covenant,*
and that properly, although not of the same covenant. For it was a covenant
 tendered by God vnto Abraham, and by him accorded vnto, to circumcise
 himselfe and all his seede of the male kinde: and the very false covenant
 was also a signe & badge of Gods peculiet fauour vnto them; and their spe-
 ciall obligation to serue him, and a marke in them, of the chosen people of
 God: so that that speech (*circumcision is the covenant*) is not figurative, but
 literall. Neither is the lambe called the Angels passing by or over, in the
 place cited by M. PER, but rather the *swearing* of it hastily and walking,
 was a signe of the Angels speedy passing by them. The lambe is sometimes
 called the *passe-over*: not because it was the signe of it, but for that it was

the

the sacrifice, celebrated in remembrance of it: so Christ is called our *pasche*, or *Paschall lamb*; because he is the *lamb* of God, sacrificed to take away the finnes of the vworld: so that not in one of these sentences, is the thing signified put for the *signe*, but rather the contrary. And when *S. Paul* saith, that *the Rocke was Christ*: it is to be vnderstood properly, because he speaketh of the *spirituall Rocke*, saying: *And they did drinke all of the spirituall Rocke, which was Christ properly*. The *materiall rocke*, out of which the *streames of water* gushed, did (in deed) prefigure Christ on the crosse, out of whose side issued bloud and water: but the *spirituall Rocke* (that is) the *Rocke* figured by that *materiall*, was really Christ himselfe: so that finally he hath not brought vs one place, where the name of the thing signified is given to the *signe*: but suppose he could bring any, would it there vpon followe, that this place of the institution of the Sacrament, must be expounded by the same figure? howe absurd and ridiculous is this manner of reasoning? In one or two places of Scripture the name of the thing signified, is given to the *signe*: ergo. In vvhhat place soeuer it pleaseth the Protestants, it shall be so taken; albeit in a thousand other places, it must needs be taken other wise.

But *M. PERKINS* saith secondly, That the Papists themselves confesse, the like figuratiue phrase to be in the institution of the cup, when it is said, This cup is the newe Testament in my blood: that is (as *M. PERKINS* interpreteth it) a *signe*, *seale*, and *pledge* of the newe Testament.

Answer. We say that the institution of that part of the Sacrament, is as plainly deliuered by *S. Mathewe* and *S. Marke*, as the other. For they haue in expresse vvordes: *This is my blood of the newe Testament*: vvhich plaine and cleare speech doth sufficiently declare, howe *S. Lukes* more intricate and obscure wordes, are to be vnderstood; it being great reason, that that which is plaine & easie to vnderstand, should interpret that which is hard, and not that which is obscure, to be made an exposition of that vvhich is lightsome & cleare, as our wranglers (who loue darkenes more then light) would perswade vs. For the better vnderstanding of *S. Lukes* wordes you must obserue, that a Testament is taken in two senses: either for the will and ordinance of the Testator; or else for the written instrument, whereby the will is knowne and performed. Nowe this holy Sacrament, may truly be called a testamēt in both senses. For it is both a special ordinance, to be obserued and practised by Christes will and institution, during the whole state of the newe Testament: and therefore truly called by *S. Luke*, *The newe Testament*; being a principall part of it.ouer and besides, it is a singuler meanes and instrument, a more effectuall then a vvritten will, to conuey and deriue vnto vs, our Lord and Sauour Christ *les* legacy,

by the worthy receiving of it, that is: his grace in this world, and glory in the next; and for this cause it is said of *S. Matthe we*. to be the *bread of the new Testament*; and not the *scale* or *signe* of it. And thus finally, the gentle reader may see, that *M. P. R.* can shew no sufficient cause, why Christs wordes should be expounded by such a strange figure: whereupon it followeth evidently, that they are to be taken according vnto their naturall literal sense. For so must all holy Scripture be vnderstood, vntill there be apparant reason to the contrary. Norwithstanding, because this matter is of very great moment, as being one of the highest mysteries of our faith, I will insitt and stand somewhat, vpon the circumstances of it. First, consider all the places together, vvhich the institution is rehearsed; and you *Mat. 26.* shall finde in them all, *This is my body*; and not in any one of them, *This is a figure of my body*; as the Protestants teach. *Mat. 14.* Secondly, *S. Luke* and *S. Paul* adde: *The body which shall be given for you*; *1. Cor. 11.* vvhich in force vs to vnderstand it to be his true naturall body; that vvas crucified for vs, and not a figure of it; which was not crucified for vs. *Luc. 22.* Thirdly, *Christ* said: *With a desire haue I desired to eat this pasche with you*. And *S. Iohn* addeth: *That Christ knowing that his houre was come, that he should passe out of this world to his Father; where as he loved this world, and the end he loved them; and when supper was done, &c. Knowing that the Father had giuen him all thinges into his handes; and that he came from God, and goeth to God; and so forth.* This Preface (I say) being made before the institution of the Sacrament, sheweth that *Christ* vehemently longed to come to it; and intended to leaue vnto his louing Disciples now at his last fare-well, a monument and token of his diuine power and loue rowardes them. If after all this, he should haue left nothing vnto them, but an order of eating a morrell of bread, and drinking a supper of wine; in remembrance of his death; there had been no congruity in it. For many much meeter men then he, had left far greater remembrances, and pledges of their loue behinde them. Wherefore the wordes must be taken as they sound; and then, no creature euer left, or could possibly leaue, the like token and pledge of his power and loue to his friends; as his owne body and blood, to be the diuine comfort and soode of their soules. And this doth that most eloquent Father *S. Iohn Chrysostome*, both *Homil. 83.* note and dilate, saying: *Laureis* when they depart from them, whom they loue, in *Mat. 26.* *he* leaues with them (for a remembrance of their hart's affection) some such jewel, or gift as they are able; but hee as becometh a saviour, *Christ*, could leaue *Homil. 2.* his owne proper flesh. And in another place: *Elias* departing from his disciples, left him his mantle; but our Saviour *Christ* did leaue vnto vs his *Antioch.* *owne body*.

An other motiue to perswade, that Christes vvordes are to be taken literally, is gathered of this, that they be a part of Christes Testament, and containe a legacy bequeathed vnto vs Christians; vvhich kinde of vvordes are alwaies to be interpreted, according to their proper signification. And it should be the most foolish part in the vvorld, vvhen a father doth by his last vvill, bequeath vnto one of his sonnes a farme, or any certaine portion of good, to pleade that the vvordes vvere to be expounded figuratiuely; and that he meant only to leaue his sonne a figure of a farme, or some signe of a portion; vvhich yet the Protestants doe pleade in this most diuine testament of our Sauour Christ Iesus. Thirdly, you haue heard before also, howe that in the institution of all Sacraments, the speeches are to be taken literally; and much more in this, vvhich is the very marrowe of Christian religion, and vvherein error is most dangerous: therefore, most requisite it was to haue bene deliuered in such termes, as vvere to be vnderstood literally. Lastly, albeit Christ oftentimes, spake vnto the multitude in parables and obscurely, because of their incredulity: yet, vnto his Disciples (vvhome he vvould haue to vnderstand him) he commonly spake plainly; or else, vvas accustomed to interpret vnto them his harder speeches, according to that: *To you it is giuen to knowe the mysteries of the Kingdome of heauen; to them it is not giuen: and therefore in parables speake I to them.* But Christ here giueth no other interpretation, then that it was the same, *His body, which should be nailed to the Crosse:* neither did the Disciples aske after any exposition of them; vvhich is a plaine signe, that they tooke them literally, the holy Ghost putting them in minde of that, which Christ had taught them before, of this admirable Sacrament, in the sixt of S. Iohn: *That he would giue them his flesh to eate; and that his flesh was truly meate, &c.*

Hitherto I haue profecuted two reasons for the reall presence: one out of the promise of it, the other out of the performance, and institution of it: vvhich are all that it pleased M. PERKINS to produce in our fauour, though he had multiplied reasons for his owne party, and enlarged them very amply; but hath as cuttely proposed ours, & loded them also with very many replies: wherefore, somewhat to supply his default herein, I will adde foure more for vs: that for a doozen of his, we may be allowed to haue halfe a doozen. The first of them which is the third in order, shall be gathered from the figure of this Sacrament thus: *The figure or shadowe of any thing, is alwaies inferior vnto the thing it selfe (as the Image of a man is not to be compared to the man himselfe, nor the shadowe to the body) but if in the Sacrament there be but bread, signifying the body of Christ, then should the figure of it be more excellent then it selfe: wherefore, to auoide that*

OF THE REALL PRESENCE.

inconuenience it must needs be granted, that the body of Christ is there really present, which farre surpasseth all the figures of it. The minor proposition is to be proued: First, to omitte all other figures of the blessed Sacrament, it is manifest, that *Manna* (raigned downe from heauen to feede the *Israelites* in the desert) was one of the principall; as our Saviour signifieth, *Iob. 6. ver.* comparing *Manna* and the food which he would giue vs, together: and *S. Paul* 49. & 58. plainly teacheth it, calling it a spirituall food, and numbring it among the figures, which the *Hebrewes* had of our Sacraments; and the proportion 1. Cor. 10. betwene the things themselves, vvith the consent of all ancient Interpreters, doth conuince it: but *Manna* farre surpassed the Protestants communion. For first, being a figure of Christ, it prefigured him as theirs doth: then it was made of Angels, and came downe from heauen; theirs cometh out of the oven, made by a baker. Again, *Manna* was so agreeable vnto their taste, that it was in taste vnto euery one, euen the most delicious and dainty meate, that he could desire: theirs is but ordinary: wherefore, they must needs confesse, either that Christes body is really present in the Sacrament; or else that the figure of it farre surmounted it, the thing it selfe. The good fellowes to auoid this inconuenience, are content to yeld vnto the *Hebrewes*, as good and vertuous Sacraments as ours be: but that also is most false. For *S. Paul* compareth theirs to shadowes, ours, to the bodie: he calleth theirs, weak and poore elements. And to omit here other testimonies cited before, Christ himselfe, expressely preferreth the food which he hath giuen vs, before *Manna*: whereupon *S. Ambrose* discoureth thus. Consider now we, whether be more excellent the bread of Angels for the flesh of Christ, which surely is the body of life: that *Manna* was from heauen; but this is above heauen: that of heauen, this the Lordes of heauen: that subject to corruption if it were kept till to morrowe; but this free from all corruption. Fourthly, the Reall presence of Christes body is proued out of these wordes of *S. Paul*: The Chalice or cuppe of benediction, which we blesse, is it not the communication of the blood of Christ? And the bread which we breake, is it not the participation of the body of our Lord? If we receiue and doe participate Christes body and blood, they are certainly there present. And the exposition of *S. Chrysostome* vpon the same place, hath stopped vp our aduersaries starting-hole, who are wont to say that we (indeed) doe receiue the bodie of Christ, yet not there present; but by faith we mount above the skies; and receiue it there. But what saith this holy and learned Doctor void of partiallity? marry, that of these wordes, this is the sense and meaning: That which is in the Chalice, is the very same that flowed out of Christes side. Note that the blood of Christ is in the Chalice, and so we need not runne so farre off to seeke it; and saith further, that we are made partakers of it.

it, with the likerall and close conjunction, as the word of God and the nature of man, were joyned together : which was not by faith or imagination only ; but actually and substantially. With vvhome accordeth S. Cyril : vvhoe out of the same wordes of S. Paul proueth, that Christes body is vnited with vs, not only by faith or charity ; but bodily and according vnto the flesh, saying : *When the vertue of the mysticall blessing is in vs, doth it not make* Lib. 10. in
Christ to dwell in vs bodily, by the participation of the flesh of Christ ? Here by Ioan. 13.
the way obserue, that the Apollle calleth the blessed Sacrament bread ; either becaue in exterior appearance, it seemeth so to be (as Angels appearing in the shape of men, are in holy write commonly called men : so the body of Christ, being vnder the forme of bread, is called bread) or els, for that bread in Scripture (according to the Hebrew phrase) signifieth al kind of foode. So is *Manna* called bread, which was rather like the dewe : Ioan. 6.
and so may our Sauours body, which is the most substantiall foode of our vers. 33.
soules, be called bread, although it be nothing lesse then ordinary bread. Psal. 77.
Lastly, it is such bread, as our Sauour in expresse tearmes hath christened it, when he said : *And the bread which I will giue you, is my flesh, for the life* Ioan. 6.
of the world. vers. 51.

Our fift argument is taken out of S. Paul : *He that eateth and drinketh vnworthily, eateth and drinketh iudgement to himselfe, not discerning the body of our Lord : and is guilty of the body and blood of our Lord :* whence I argue thus. Vers. 29.
Vnworthy receiuers, who are destitute of that faith, whereby they should receiue Christ (according vnto the Protestants opinion) or els they should not receiue vnworthily : such vnworthy communicants (I say) doe receiue the body of Christ, albeit vnworthily ; therefore, it is not the receiuers faith that maketh it present, but it is there present by the vvordes of consecration, whether the party beleue it or no : or else, howe should the man eate his iudgement, for not discerning Christes body, and be guilty of his body : the Protestants answer first, *That he is guilty of the body : because he receiueth it not then, when he should, for lacke of faith :* But this glose is cleane contrary to the text, that faith expressly. That they receiue it by eating and drinking of it ; but yet vnworthily : and all ancient Interpreters doe so expound it. Let one S. Augustine serue in steed of the rest, who saith : *That like as Iudas (to whome our Lord gaue the morsell) gaue place to the Denill,* De baptis.
not by receiuing that which was euill, but by receiuing of it euilly : euen so, every contr. Do-
one receiuing our Lordes Sacrament vnworthily, doth not make it euill, because he natist. lib.
is euill, or receiue nothing, because he receiueth it not to saluation. For it was the 5. cap. 8.
body and blood of Christ, euen to them of whome the Apostle saith : He that eateth vnworthily, eateth his owne damnation. By which notable sentence of so worthy a Prelate, the other caull of our wrangling young-Masters, is also

confuted. For they (perceiving that their former shift would not serue their turnes) fly vnto a second; that (forsooth) the vnworthy receiuer is guilty of Christes body, because he abuseth the signe of it: for the dishonour done to the picture, redoundeth so the person himselfe.

Reply. When we complaine of them for dishonouring of Images, and tel them that they thereby dishonour the Saints, alleading this sentence, *That the dishonour done to the picture, redoundeth to the person*: then they will not allowe of it, which nowe they are glad to take hold of. To the purpose, we say first, that the Sacrament is no picture of Christ, no not in their owne opinion, but a signe only: and great difference is there betwene disfiguring a mans owne picture, and abusing of some signe or signification of him: neither is the disfiguring or breaking of a mans picture, so heinous a fault, if it be not done expressely in contempt of the person; which formall contempt, is not to be found in many vnworthy receiuers. Lastly, the *Israelites* that eate *Manna*, or drunke of the *Rocke* vnworthily, were not guilty of Christes body and blood, although those thinges were figures and figures of them: therfore, if there were nothing, but a signe of Christes bodie in our Sacrament, no man should be guilty of so heynous a crime, for vnworthy receiuing of it: but being by the verdict of *S. Paul*, made guilty of damnation for not discerning Christes bodie, it must needes followe, that Christes body is there really present.

To these arguments collected out of holy Scriptures, let vs joyne one other of no lesse authority taken from miracles done in confirmation of the real presence. For a true miracle cannot be done to confume any vntruth: or else God (by whose only power they are wrought) should resist an vntruth, which is impossible. One miracle, of preserving a young boy alive in a glassiers hot burning furnace, I haue before rehearsed out of *Nicophorus*, cited by *M. Pen*: two others I will choose out of hundreths, because they be recorded in famous Authors, and my purpose is to be briefe.

The first, out of the life of *S. Gregory* the great, surnamed by venerable *Bede* the Apostle of England. This most honourable Bishop administering the blessed Sacrament, came to giue it vnto the woman who had made those Hostes which he had consecrated. She hearing *S. Gregory* say (as the manner was and is) *The body of our Lord Iesus Christ preserve thy soule vnto euerlasting life*, smiled at it: wherefore, the holy Bishoppe withdrew his hand, and did not communicate her, but laide that Host downe vpon the Altar: Masse being done, he called the woman before him, and demanded before the people (whom shee might haue scandalized) what was the cause, why shee beganne to laugh in that holy and fearefull misterie: she muttered at the first, but after answered, that she knewe it to be

Ex vita
per Ioan.
Diac. lib.

Greg. 9.

Greg. 9.

Greg. 9.

Greg. 9.

Greg. 9.

Greg. 9.

be the bread, vvhich she her selfe had made; and therefore could not beleeue it to be the body of Christ, as he called it. Then the holy man prayed earnestly to God, that in confirmation of the true presence of Christes body in the Sacrament, the outward forme of bread might be turned into flesh, vvhich vvvas (by the power of God) done presently; and so was she conuerted to the true faith, and all the rest confirmed in it. The other miracle is of record, in the life of that deuout Father S. Bernard. This holy man, caused a vvoman (who had bene many yeares possessed with a wicked spirit, that did strangely torment her) to be brought before him; as he vvvas at Masse; and then holding the consecrated Host over the womans head, spake these vvordes. *Thou wicked spirit, here is present thy judge, the supreme power, is here present; resist and if thou canst: be is here present, who being to suffer for our saluation, said: Nowe the Prince of this world shall be cast forth; and pointing to the blessed Sacrament, said: This is that body that was borne of the body of the Virgin, that was stretched vpon the Crosse, that lay in the Sepulcher, that rose from Death, that in the sight of his Disciples ascended into Heauen: therefore, in the dreadfull power of this Majesty, I command thee wicked spirit, that thou depart out of this bandmaide of his, and neuer hereafter presume once to touch her.* The Deuill was forced to acknowledge the Majesticall presence, and dreadfull power of Christes body in that holy Host, and to gette him packing presently; wherefore, he must needs be greatly blinded of the Deuill, that knowing this miracle to be vvrought, by the vertue of Christes body there present, vvill not yet beleeue and confesse it. But nowe let vs vvinde vp all this question, in the testimonies of the most ancient and best approued Doctors.

S. Ignatius the Apostles Scholler, saith: *I desire the bread of God, beauenly bread, which is the flesh of the Sonne of God.* Epist. 15. ad Rom.

S. Iustine declaring the faith of the Christians, in the second hundredth yeare after Christ, vvriteth to the Emperor Antonine, thus: *We take not these things as common bread, nor as common wine, but as Christ incarnate by the word of God; took flesh and blood for our saluation: euen so are we taught, that the fode (where with our flesh is by alteration nourished) being by him blessed and made the Eucharist, is the flesh and blood of the same Iesus incarnate.* Apol. 2.

S. Irenaeus Iustins equall proneth, both Christ to be the Sonne of God, the creatour of the vvorld; and also the resurrection of the bodies, by these the reall presence of Christes body in the blessed Sacrament: so assured a principle, and so generally confessed a truth was then, this point of the reall presence.

Homil. 5. in diuers. Origen that most learned Doctor saith : When thou takest that holy foode, and that incorruptible feast ; when thou enjoyest the bread and cup of life ; when thou doest eate and drinke the body and blood of our Lord : then (loe) doth our Lord enter vnder thy roose. Thou therefore humbling thy selfe, imitate this Cen-
turion and say : O Lord, I am not worthy that thou shouldest enter vnder my
roose, &c.

De cena Domini. S. Cyprian : The bread that our Lord deliuered vnto his Disciples, being not
in our ward for we, but in substance changed ; was by the omnipotent power of the
word, made flesh.

Catech. 4. mist. S. Cyril Patriarke of Hierusalem, doth most formally teach our doctrine,
saying : When Christ himselfe doth affirm of bread : This is my body, who af-
terward dareth to doubt of it ? and be confirming and saying, This is my blood.
Who can doubt and say, this is not his blood ? And a little after doth proue it,
saying : He before changed water into wine, which cometh neare to blood ; and
shall be thought vnworthy to be beleued, that he hath changed wine into his
blood ? wherefore, let vs receiue with all assurance, the body and blood of Christ :
for vnder the forme of bread, his body is giuen vs ; and his blood, vnder the forme
of wine.

Orat. 2. de Paschate. S. Gregory Nazianzene, speaking of the blessed Sacrament, sayeth :
Without shame and doubt, eate the body and drinke the blood, and doe not mistrust
those wordes of the flesh, &c.

Homil. 83. in Matib. S. Iohn Christostome Patriarke of Constantinople, perswadeth the same
thus : Let vs alwaies beleue God, and not resist him, though that which he saith,
seeme absurd to our imagination : which we must doe in all thinges ; but specially in
holy misteries ; not beholding those thinges only, which are set in our sight ; but

^a *Hom. 61 ad populū.* hauing an eye vnto his wordes. For his word cannot deceiue vs ; but our senses may
most easily be deceived : wherefore ; considering that he saith, This is my body ;
^b *1^a 1^a hom.* let vs not doubt of it at all, but beleue it. Again, ^a what stoop-beard doth feede
^{3.} *in epist.* his flocke with his owne flesh ? Nay, many mothers giue out their children to be
ad *Ephe.* nursed of others : but Christ with his owne flesh and blood, doth feede vs. ^b It is
^c *Homil.* his flesh and blood, that suiteth aboue the heauens ; that is humbly adored of the
^{24.} *in 1.* Angels. And ^c he that was adored of the wise-men in the manger, is now pre-
ad *Corin.* sent vpon the Altar. ^d And not by faith only, or by charity : but in deede and
^d *Hom. 83 in Matib.* really, his flesh is joynd with ours, by receiuing this holy Sacrament.

Ex 60. ad populū. S. Ambrose : ^a Thou maist (perhaps) say, that my bread is but common
bread ; this bread is bread in deede, before the wordes of the Sacrament : but
populū. when consecration cometh ; of bread, it is made the body of Christ. And if you
^e *Litr. 4. de Sacra-* demand further, howe there can be any such vertue in vwordes : he doth
ment. *c. 4.* answer, That by the word of God, heauen and earth were made, and all that in
them is : and therefore, if Gods word were able of nothing to make all thinges,

howe much more easily, can it take a thing that already is, and turne it into an other?

S. Hierome: Let vs beare and beleene, that the bread which our Lord brake, *Epistol. an* and gave to his Disciples, is the body of our Lord and Saviour. * And God *Hedib.* forbidde (saith he) that I should speake sinistrously of Priestes, who succe- *quast. 2.* ding the Apostles in degree; doe with their holy mouth, consecrate and make * *Epist. ad* Christes body. *Heliodorū*

S. Augustine: The mediatour of God and men, the man Iesus Christ, giuing *Cont. Ad-* vs his flesh to eat, and his blood to drinke; we doe receiue it with faithfull hart *uers. legis* and mouth, although it seeme more horrible to eate mans flesh, then to kill it; and *& Prophe* to drinke mans blood, then to shedde it. Again, * The very blood that through *lib. 2. c. 9.* their malice the Iewes shedde, they (conuered by Gods grace) doe drinke. And * *In psal.* vpon the 98. Psalme, he doth teach vs to adore Christes body in the Sa- *65. & 93* crament, vvith Godly honour; where he saith: Christ tooke earth of earth, for flesh is of earth: and of the flesh of the Virgin Mary he tooke flesh; in which flesh he walked here vpon the earth, and the same flesh he gaue vs to eat.

S. Cyril Patriarke of Alexandria, in the declaration of the cleauenth *Anathe* Anatheme of the generall Councell of Ephesus: doth in fewe wordes ex- *pre* presse the ancient faith both of the Sacrifice and Sacrament, thus: We doe *cele* celebrate the holy, lively, and vnbloudy Sacrifice, beleening it to be the body and *blond* blond, not of a common man like vnto one of vs: but rather we receiue it, as the pro- *per* per body and blond of the word of God, that quickeneth all thinges, which he *doth* doth often in his workes repete. In his Epistle to Nestorius in these wordes: *Epist. ad* We doe so come vnto the mysticall benediction, and are sanctified; being made par- *Nestoriū.* takers of the holy and pretious blond of Christ our redeemer: not receiuing it as *common* common flesh (which God defend) nor as the flesh of a holy man, &c. But being *made* made the proper flesh of the word of God it selfe. And vpon these vvordes, *Howe* Howe can this man giue vs his flesh to eat? he saith: Let vs giue firme faith to *Lib. 4. in* the misteries, and neuer once say or thinke, howe can it be? For it is a Iewish *Ioan. c. 13* word. And elsewhere preuenting our Protestants receiuing by faith alone, *Lib. 10. in* he addeth: We denie not, but by a right faith and sincere charity, we are spiri- *Ioan. c. 13* tually joynd with Christ: but to say, that we haue not also a consuetudine with him *accord* according to the flesh; that we utterly denie, and doe auouch it to be wholly dis- *nant* tant from holy Scriptures.

Damascene: Bread and wine (vvith vvater) by the innocation of the holy *Lib. 4. de* Ghost, are supernaturally changed into the body and blond of Christ: bread is not *side* the figure of the body, nor wine the figure of the blond (which God forbidde) but *cap. 14* it is the very body of our Lord, joynd vvith the God-head: See howe formally *this* this holy and learned Doctor, about nine hundred yeares agoe confuted *the* the opinion of Zwinglius.

In ca. 26. So doeth Theophilast also, about the same time writing thus: *Christ did not say, this is a figure: but this is my body. For albeit it seeme bread vnto vs; yet is it by his vnspcakable working transformed.*

If I would descend a little lower, I might allcadge vvhole volumes, vvritten by the learnest of those times, in defence of the reall presence. For some thousand yeares after Christ, there started vp one Berengarius of condemned memory, vvho vvas the first, that directly impugned the truth of Christes bodily presence in the Sacrament: but he once or twise abjured it afterward, and died repentantly.

And thus much of this matter.

OF THE SACRIFICE.

M. PERKINS Page 204.

Of the Sacrifice in the Lordes supper, which the Papists call the Sacrifice of the Masse.

Touching this point, first I will set downe, what must be vnderstood by the name of Sacrifice. A Sacrifice is taken properly, or vnproperly. Properly, it is a sacred or solemne action, in which man offereth and consecrateth some outward bodily thing vnto God, to please and honour him thereby: improperly and by the way of resemblance, all the duties of the morall lawe are called sacrifices.

M. PERKINS definition of a Sacrifice taken properly, is not complete: for it may be applyed vnto many oblations, vvich vv ere not sacrifices. For example, diuers deuout Israelites offered some gold, some siluer, some other things to honour and please God withall, in the building of a Tabernacle for diuine seruice, according to his owne order and commandement. These mens actions were both sacred and solemne, and some outward bodily thing, by them vvas offered and consecrated vnto God, to please and honour him thereby: therefore, they did properly offer Sacrifice (according to M. PER. definition) which in true diuinity is absurd, or else vvomen and children might be sacrificers. Again, if his definition were perfect, I cannot see howe they can denie their Lordes supper to be a Sacrifice properly. For they must needs graunt, that it is a sacred or solemne action: and they cannot denie, but that in it a man offereth and consecrateth vnto God some outward bodily thing (to vv it) bread and vvine; and that

Exod. 25.
& 35.

to please and honour God thereby : so that all the parts of M. PER. definition agreeing to it, he cannot denie it to be a Sacrifice properly. We (in dedde) that take it to be a prophane or superstitious action, highly displeasing God, as being by mans inuention brought in, to shoulde out his true and only seruice; doe vpon iust reason reject it, as no Sacrifice: but the *Protestants* that take it for diuine seruice, must needs admit it to be a proper Sacrifice; & so doe they fall by their owne definition, into that damnable abomination (as they tearme it) of maintayning an other proper Sacrifice in the newe Testament, besides Christes death on the Crosse.

Wherefore, to make vp the definition perfect, it is to be added: first, that that holy action be done by a *lawful Minister*, and then that the visible thing there presented, be not only offered to God, but be also really altered and consumed, in testification of Gods *soueraigne dominion* ouer vs. We agree in the other improper acception of a Sacrifice, and say; that al good workes done to please and honour God, may be called sacrifices improperly: among which the inward act of adoration (whereby a deuout minde doth acknowledge God to be the beginning, middle, and end of all good both in heauen & earth, and as such a one, doth most humbly prostrate, honour and adore him) holdeth the most worthyest ranke; and may truly be called an inuisible and inward Sacrifice: The outward testimony and protestation thereof, by consuming some visible thing, in a *solemne manner* and by a *chosen Minister*, is most properly a Sacrifice.

OVR CONSENT.

M After PERKINS would gladly seeme to agree with vs in two points: First, *That the supper of the Lord is a Sacrifice, and may truly be so called as it is, and hath beene in former ages.* Secondly, *That the very body of Christ is offered in the Lordes supper.* Howe say you to this, are we not herein at perfect concord? a plaine dealing man would thinke so, hearing these his wordes: but if you reade further, and see his exposition of them, we are as farre as square as may be. For M. PER. in handling this question will (as he saith) take a Sacrifice sometimes properly and sometimes improperly starting from the one to the other at his pleasure, that you cannot know where to haue him. So when he saith in his first conclusion, *That the supper of the Lord is a Sacrifice*, he vnderstandeth improperly: yet it is (saith he) called a Sacrifice in three respects. First, because it is a memoriall of the reall Sacrifice of Christ on the Crosse. So a painted Crucifix may be called a Sacrifice, because it is a memoriall of that Sacrifice: but M. PER. addeth, *That it is such* Hebr. 13. all containeth a thanks-giuing to God for the same: which thanks-giuing is the vers. 15. Sacrifice and calues of our lips,

May he not seeme worthy of a calves-head to his breakefast, that being in a serious dispute of a Sacrifice, would say that the thanks-giving for a Sacrifice, may trulie be called the very same Sacrifice it selfe: for so a thankes-giving for a howse, may truly be called a howse; and the thank-giving for a horse, a horse it selfe: and to say that the ancient Fathers so spake (as M. P. ER. doth) is to make them babes and too too vnkilfull how to speake. Secondly; (saith he) it may be called a Sacrifice; because every communicant doth there present himselfe an acceptable Sacrifice to God, to worke in the practise of all dutiefull obedience. You should haue said, that the receiuing of the Lordes supper worthily, might rather be called a Sacrifice, then the supper it selfe, if you put the reason of the Sacrifice, only in the receivers conceit and deuotion, which is very different from the supper it selfe. Thirdly; (saith he) The Lordes supper is called a Sacrifice, in respect of almesse given to the poore, which was joyned with it: and in this regard also the ancient Fathers haue called the Sacrament, an vnblondy Sacrifice; and the table, an Altar; and the Ministers; Priests; and the whole action, an Oblation; not to God, but to the congregation; and not by the Priest alone, but by the people.

I pray you take not the ancient Fathers for so simple, as to thinke the Sacrament to be a Sacrifice, because some almes might happily be (then and there) giuen to the poore: For they teach that a Sacrifice, is a soueraigne seruice done vnto God alone, and not to be offered to any mortall crea-

Libr. 20. *Witnesse one S. Augustine for the rest, who saith: To that worship*
 cont. Fau- *which is proper to God alone, doth appertaine the offering of Sacrifice. We doe in*
 stum c. 25 *no sort offer any such thing, or command it to be offered, either to any Martir, or*

any body soule, or Martir, &c. And what a dotage is it, to dreame that Priests
and Altars take their names of that, that almes is giuen by lay-men to the
poore at Masse time, wherein there is neyther congruity, nor likelihood at
all: nor hath he any author to warrant it. For almes by the Apostles order,

Act. 6. *was left vnto the disposition of Deacons; & Priests commonly did not me-*
 In exhor. *dle in it: at least, it neuer was any essentiall point of their vocation: Which*
 ad casti- *was (as Tertullian briefly defineth) to teach, to minister the Sacrament, and to*
 tatem. *offer Sacrifice. Nowe Deacons might not in any case offer Sacrifice; as the*

Conc. 14. *whole Church in her purity defined, at the Council of Nice: wherefore,*
 or Conc. *there is no colour to say, that the vnblondy Sacrifice, Priests, and Altars,*
 Carth. 4. *were so called in respect of almes giuen to the congregation. We denie*
 cap. 4. *not, but that deuout people offered at Masse time, either bread and wine*

towards the Sacrifice, or money towards the reliefe of the Priest, and
maintainance of the Altar: but that was not called the Sacrifice of the Masse
by the Fathers, but distinguished from it expressly. Witnesse that very
place, cited by M. P. ER. out of S. Augustine; who (comforting his friend

pitti-

pittifully lamenting the captivity of three virgins, taken prisoners and led away captiue by Infidels) citeth the example of *Azarias*, and his fellow captiues in *Babylon*, of whome honourable mention is made in *Daniel*. Whereupon he saith, *These virgins be in captivity now, as were then those Israelites in a beaten country, where they could not sacrifice unto our Lord after their lawe, because Hierusalem was the only place where they might offer Sacrifice: So (saith he) these virgins now cannot, either carry an offering to the Altar of God; or finde a Priest there, by whome they may offer it to God.* These be his wordes; by which he is so farre from saying, that women did offer Sacrifice at the Altar, (as M. PER. falsely translateth, *ferre oblationem ad altare Dei*) that he plainly teacheth the contrarie, the place of their captivity affording them, neither Altars nor Priests. Now both those captiue Israelites in *Babylon*, and these captiue virgins, might and did devoutly fast and pray, and might also to their power giue almes; and yet (as testifieth *S. Augustine*) they could not offer Sacrifice, because they wanted a conuenient place, *Priester*, and Altars: wherevpon it followeth most evidently (euen by the testimony which M. PER. alleadgeth for himselfe) that the giuing of Almes, and other godly deuotions of lay-men, doe not make *Priester* and Altars, or giue them their names; but be most distinct things from them, as shall more amply be shewed hereafter out of the ancient Fathers, who make the Sacrifice of the *Mass*, a most proper kinde of Sacrifice; yet vnbloudie, because ther is no bloud shed there, but the body and bloud of Christ are offered vnder the formes of bread and wine: not (as M. PER. saith in his second conclusion) *in figure only and representation*; but also really and most truly. We denie not the Sacrifice of Christes body in the *Mass*, to be a representation of Christes suffering on the Crosse; but affirme it to be such a representation, as contayneth withall, the same reall body there vnbloudily sacrificed; which *S. Augustine* fully testifieth in these fewe wordes. *Christians doe celebrate the memory of the Sacrifice (already performed on the Crosse) by the very holy Oblation and participation of the body of Christ: we say therefore with the same author, by M. PER. alleadged, That Sacraments haue the resemblance of things, whereof they are the Sacramentes; but say further, that besides the resemblance, they containe also the things which they resemble.* As baptism hath by washing the body outwardlie, a resemblance of washing the soule inwardly from sinnes; and withall doth when it is ministred truly, wash and purge it from all sinne. So that it is a foule kinde of reasoning in the matter of Sacraments, to argue thus as the Protestants vse; *It is the signe, or the representation of such a thing; therefore the thing it selfe is not there present*: whereas the contrary is most certaine; that it is the signe of such a

thing, *ergo*, the thing it selfe is there present; because all Sacraments of the newe Testament, doe containe and worke that which they signifie, as shall be more amply proued in his proper place. Neither doe we denie, but that by a true faith in Christ and his passion (so it vwant not other necessary parts of Christian religion) a man is made partaker of the merit of it. But what is that against the Sacrifice of the *Masse*? one truth doth not disproue an other: but we shall heare the man (perhaps) argue more substantially anone, when he draweth nearer the matter. Thus much of our fained consents, which M. P. *an*. putteth downe to peruert the ancient Fathers plaine sentences, for the Sacrifice of the *Masse*, & to make his poore abused followers beleene, that vwhen they approue the Sacrifice of the *Masse* (as they doe very often, and that in most expresse termes, as you shal heare hereafter) that then they meane some other matter. Much more sincerely had he dealt, if he had confessed with his owne *Rabbins*, that it was the common beleefe of the world, receiued by the best Schoole-men:

a Lib. 4. Instit. co. 18. §. 1. That in the *Masse* a Sacrifice is offered to God for remission of finnes, as *a Calvin* doth deliuer; vvhich *b Luther* graunteth to be conformable vnto the saying of the ancient Fathers. And one *c Alberus* (a famous *Lutheran*) speaketh into the great glory of his Master *Luther*, that he vvas the first since Christes time, who openly inueighed against it: this yet, is more ingenuous and plainer dealing, to confesse the truth, then with vaine colours to goe about to disguise it. And that the indifferent reader may be vvell assured, howe *Luther* (an *Apostata* *Enim*) could come vnto that high pitch of vnderstanding, as to loare vnto that, which none suchence Christes time (neither *Apostles* nor other) could reach vnto before him: let him reade a speciall treatise of his owne, Intituled of *Masse* in corners, and of the corruption of Priests: which is extant in the sixt Tome of his workes, set out in the German tongue, and printed at *Lenes*, as men skilfull in that language doe tell me. In his workes, which were printed at *Wittenburge* of the older edition, it is the seauenth Tome, though somewhat corrected and abridged: there (I say) the good fellowe confesseth, that entering into a certaine conference and dispute with the *Duell*, about this Sacrifice of the *Masse*, *Luther* then defending it, and the *Deuill* very grauely arguing against it, in fine the Master (as it was likely) overcame his Disciple *Luther*, and so settled him in that opinion against the Sacrifice of the *Masse*, that he doubted not afterward to maintayne it, as a principle point of the newe Gospel, and is therein forarded by the vvhole band of *Protestants*. This is no fable, but a true history, set downe in print by himselfe, through Gods providence: that all the vvhorld may see from vvhath authority, thus their doctrine against the blessed Sacrifice of the *Masse* proceedeth.

And

And if they will beleue it (notwithstanding they knowe the Deuill to be the founder of it) are they not then most vvorthy to be rejected of God, and adjudged to him, whose Disciples they make themselves vvitingly and of their owne free accord?

Nowe to the difference.

OUR DIFFERENCE.

M. PERKINS Page 207. 10.

They make the Eucharist to bee a reall; and externall Sacrifice offered vnto God; holding that the Minister of it, is a Priest properly, in that he offereth Christes body and bloud to God, really and properly vnder the formes of bread and wine: we acknowledge no such Sacrifice for remission of sinne, but only Christes on the Crosse once offered. Here is the maine difference, which is of such moment; that their Church maintaining this, can bee no Church at all: for this pointe raiseh the foundation to the very bottom; which he will proue by the reasons following; if his ayne faile him not.

Obserue, that in the lawe of Moyses there were three kinde of proper Sacrifices; one called *Holocaust*, or vvhole burnt offerings; the second an *Host for sinne*, of vvhich there were also diuers sortes, chiefly an *Host of pacification*. *Holocaustes* were wholly consumed by fire, in recognizance and protestation of Gods Soueraigne dominion ouer vs: *Hostes for sinne* were offered (as the name importeth) to appease Gods wrath; and to purge men from sinne: *Hostes of pacification* or peace, were to giue God thanks for benefites receiued, and to sue for continuance and increase of them.

Nowe we following the ancient Fathers doctrine, doe hold the Sacrifice of the Masse, to succcede all those sacrifices, and to contayne the vertue and efficacy of all three, to vvit: it is offered both to acknowledge God to be the supreme Lord of heauen and earth, and that all our good cometh from him: as vvitnessth this oblation of his deare Sonnes body, who bring the Lord of heauen and earth, willingly suffered death to shewe his obedience to his Father. Secondly, it is offered to appease Gods vvrath, justly kindled against vs sinners, representing to him therein, the merit of Christes passion to obtaine our pardon. Thirdly, it is offered to God, to giue him thanks for all his graces bestowed vpon vs; and by the vertue thereof to erue continuance and increase of them. These points of our doctrine being openly laide before the eyes of the

world, M. P. E. R. seemeth to reprove only one peece of them, to wit: *That the Sacrifice of the Masse, is no true Sacrifice for remission of finnes*: and not, denying issue with vs, but vpon that branch only; he may be thought to agree vvith vs in the other two, to wit: that it is a proper and perfect kinde of whole burnt offering, and a Sacrifice of pacification; at least, he goeth not about to disprove the rest, and therefore he had need to spit on his fingers (as they say) and to take better hold: or else, if that were graunted him, which he endeauoureth to proue, he is very farre from obtayning the Sacrifice of the Masse, to be no true and proper kinde of Sacrifice. For it may well be an *Holocaust*, or *Host of pacification*, though it be not a Sacrifice for sinne. But charall men may see, howe confident we are in every part and parcell of the *Catholike* doctrine, we will ioine issue with him, where he thinketh to haue the most advantage against vs: and will proue it to be also an *Host* for remission of finnes, and that aswel for the dead, as for the liuing, which is much more then M. P. E. R. requireth: and by the way I will demonstrate, that this doctrine is so farre off from *raising the foundation of Christian religion*, that there can be no religion at all, vvithout a true and proper kinde of Sacrifice, and sacrificing Priests. But first I will confute, M. P. E. R. reasons to the contrary, because he placeth them foremost.

Hebr. 9. The first reason: *The holy Ghost saith, Christ offered himselfe but once; there-
v. 15. 16. fore no often: and that there can be no reall offering of his body and blood, in the
& ca. 10. Sacrament of his supper; the next is plaine*

vers. 10. True, but your arguing out of it is somewhat vaine. For after your owne opinion, it is the Priest that doth offer the Sacrifice of Christs body in the Lordes supper; and therefore, though Christ offered it but once (as the Apostle saith) yet Priests appointed by him, may offer it many times. Doe yee perceiue howe easily your Achilles may be foiled? the good man not looking (belike) for this answer, saith nothing to it, but frameth another in our names, vvich is also good and true, to wit: *That the Apostle there speaketh of the bloody Sacrifice of Christ on the Crosse, which was but once offered: which is true; but that the same his body, may be vnder the formes of bread and wine sacrificed often, by the Ministry of Priests in the Masse*. Yes; but it doth (saith M. P. E. R.) For the Author of the Epistle to the Hebrewes, (he will not for twenty pound say it was S. Paul) taketh it for graunted, that the Sacrifice of Christ is only one; and that a bloody Sacrifice: for he saith Christ doth

Hebr. 9. not offer himselfe often, as the high Priestles did, &c. All this is true, that Christ suffered but once vpon the Crosse; but it is nothing against the former answer, in vvich it is not said, that Christ offered himselfe twice vpon the Crosse; but that the same his body is daylie, by the Ministry of Priests, offered vnbloudily vnder the formes of bread and wine, vpon the

the Altar : which being so plaine and sensible, a man might meruaile at their palpable grossenesse, if they cannot conceiue it. I thinke rather that they vnderstand it well enough; but not knowing what reasonably to reply against it, doe make as though they vnderstood it not : Whereupon, this man (not hauing said one vvord to the purpose against the answer) yet concludeth (as though he had confuted all that we haue in holy Scripture for this Sacrifice) *That the Scriptures (forsooth) neuer knewe the twofold manner of sacrificing Christ : and then goeth on triumphing, That euery distinction in diuinity not founded in the written word, is but a forgery of mans braine.* Had he not need of a messe of good broath, to coole his hotte hasty braine, that thus runneth away with a supposed victory, before he hath strooken any one good stroke ? but he saith further (cleane besides the drift of his former argument, as his manner is, sometime to droppe downe a sentence by the way, which seemeth to make for him) *That without shedding of blood, there is no remission of finnes :* meaning (belike) that if our Sacrifice be vnbloudy, then it doth not remit sinne.

Hebr. 9.
vers. 22.

Answer. If no remission of sinne be obtayned nowe, without shedding of blood : howe haue they remission of their finnes by only faith ? vvhath doth their faith drawe blood of them ? The direct answer is apparant in the Apostles vvordes, vvho saith : *That all thinges almost, according to the lawe are cleansed with blood : and that there was no remission of sinnes (in the lawe of Moyse) without shedding of blood.* What a shamefull abusing of a text was this, to apply that to vs in the state of the newe Testament, vvhihch vvvas plainly spoken of the state of the old Testament, and of Moyse's lawe ?

His second reason : *The Romish Church holdeth, that the Sacrifice in the Lordes supper, is all one for substance, with the Sacrifice offered on the Crosse : if that be so, then the Sacrifice in the Eucharist must either be a continuance of the Sacrifice begunne on the Crosse, or else an alternation or repetition of it. Let them choose of these twaine which they will. If they say, it is a continuance of it, then they make the Priest to bring to perfection, that which Christ beganne : If they say it is a repetition, then also they make it imperfect. For to repeat a thing often, argueth that at once it was not sufficient ; which is the reason of the holy Ghost, vvho proueth the sacrifices of the old Testament to be imperfect.*

Answer. that vvhen an argument consisteth of diuision, then if any part or member of the diuision be omitted, the argument is nought worth, as the learned knowe : so fareth it in this fallacy. For the Sacrifice of the Mass is neither a continuance of the Sacrifice on the Crosse, nor for Merit : a frivolous reason (for not all thinges are bettered, but many made much vvorse by continuance) but because the one is not immediately

lincked with the other, there going much time betweene them: Neither is it (to speake properly) a repetition of the Sacrifice of the Crosse, because that was bloody, this vnbloudy; that, offered by Christ in his owne person, this, by the ministry of a Priest: that, on the Crosse, this, on the Altar: that, to pay the generall ranfome, and to purchase the redemption of all mankind, this, to apply the vertue of that vnto particuler men: So that although there be in both these Sacrifices, the same body and blood of Christ in substance; yet, the manner, meanes, and end of them, being so different, the one cannot conveniently be called the repetition of the other: but the Sacrifice of the Masse is a lively representation of the Sacrifice on the Crosse, and the application of the vertue of it to vs. This is the third member of the diuision, either not knowine, or concealed by M. PERKINS, the better to colour and cloake the deceite of his second false argument. Nowe to the third.

The third reason. *Ateall and outward Sacrifice in a Sacrament, is against the nature of a Sacrament, and specially the supper of the Lord: for one of the ends thereof, is to keepe in memory the Sacrifice of Christ: Nowe euery remembrance must be of a thing absent, past, and done: and if Christ be daylie really sacrificed, the Sacrament is not a fit memoriall of his Sacrifice.*

Answer. Christs Sacrifice offered on the Crosse, is long since past and done, and therefore absent: wherefore, it may well haue a memoriall, and there can be no other so lively representation of it, as to haue the same body (yet in another manner) set before our eyes, as hath beene more then once already declared, which may serue to answer the later proposition.

M. PERKINS confirmeth his former thus: *The principall end of a Sacrament is, that God may giue, and we receiue Christ and his benefits. Nowe in a real sacrifice, God doth not giue Christ to vs, but the Priest offereth vp Christ to God: therefore, one thing cannot be both a Sacrament and a Sacrifice.*

Answer. One and the same thing may well be both, but in diuers respects. It is a Sacrifice, in that it is an holy Oblation of a sensible thing vnto God, by consuming of it in testification of his Souerainety: It is a Sacrament, as it is a visible signe of an inuisible grace, bestowed then vpon the receiuer. So was the Pasche lamb first sacrificed to God (as shall be proued hereafter) and after eaten in a Sacrament. In like manner, the holy body and blood of Christ, are (vnder the visible formes of bread and wine) offered vp first to God, by the sacred action of consecration, and after broken and eaten, in recognizance of his supreme dominion over all creatures: which is a Sacrifice most properly taken. And againe, it is instituted by Christ to signifie and worke the spiritual nuture of our soules by receiuing of it: and so it is a Sacrament.

OF THE SACRIFICE.

83

M. PERKINS fourth reason. *The holy Ghost maketh a difference, betweene Christ; the high Priest of the newe Testament; and all the Leuiticall Priestes; in this, that they were many, one succeeding another: but he is only one, hauing an eternall Preest-hood, which cannot passe from him to any other. Nowe if this difference be good, then Christ alone in his owne person, must be the Priest of the newe Testament, and no other with, or vnder him: If they say that the whole action is done in the person of Christ, and that the Priest is but his Minister, and an instrument vnder him (as they say in deede) I say againe, it is false, because the whole Oblation is acted by the Priest, and he that doth all, is more then a bare instrument.* Hebr. 7. vers. 24

Answer. To beginne with that, which he saith last (because I must stay longer on the first) he bewrayeth his ignorance in the matter of the Masse, when he saith, that the Priest acteth the whole Oblation in his owne name, and not as the minister of Christ: for the principall part of both Sacrifice and Sacrament, consisteth in the consecration, as we holde, which the Priest wholly executeth in the name and person of Christ. For consecrating he saith, *This is my body*, speaking in the person of Christ, and not in his owne person, saying, *this is Christes body*; in like sorte he consecrath the Chalice, *This is the Chalice of my blood*. So that nothing is more certaine, then that the Sacrifice of our Lordes supper is offered by the Priest, as the Minister and instrument of Christ: wherefore M. PERKINS apothegorically (I say againe) is conuincd to be most vntrue. Nowe to the former part of his mistaking the Apostles discourse, which is farre more profound then the Protestants take it to be: for his purpose is to proue; that Consummation (as he there speaketh) was not by the Leuiticall Priesthood, that is; that the Priest of Moyses lawe could not offer vp such a Sacrifice to God, by vertue whereof Gods iustice could be satisfied; and the redemption of all mankind purchased. For if any of the high Priestes could haue performed that, there needed not to haue beene many Priestes, or any one successor to an other, because the former should sufficiently haue done that already, vvhich the later vvent about to doe: wherefore, the Apostle concludeth that it was necessary, that an other Priest should rise according to the order of Melchisedeck, whose one oblation should be so pretious in Gods sight, and of such infinite value, that it should neede, neyther to be offered twice, nor to haue the supply of any other Sacrifice: vvhich we vvvillingly graunt, and teach daylie; but carry alyvayes in minde, that the Apostle there, treateth only of that compleate Sacrifice, which procured the generall redemption of all men, and payed the iust price vnto God; for the sinnes of the vvhole vvorlde: of vvhich sort we acknowledge that Sacrifice vvhich our Saviour offered

Cap. 7.
vers. 11.

offered on the Crosse, to be the only *Sacrifice*, fully satisfying the rigour of Gods justice; for the offences of all the world, and as plentifully purchasing all kinde of graces, to be bestowed vpon all degrees of men; so that it needeth not to be repeated it selfe, or to haue any supply from any other *Sacrifice*. But all this doth no more proue, that our *Sacrifice* of the Masse is not a true and proper *Sacrifice*, then that the *Leuiticall sacrifices* were no *sacrifices*. For *S. Pauls* scope is not to proue, that there were not, or should not be any more *sacrifices* but one: but that there can be but one such an absolute and perfect *sacrifice*, as Christes was on the Crosse. Well then if that one *sacrifice* of Christ on the Crosse, be so complete and absolute, what neede is there of any other *sacrifice*? great neede, and that for three causes. First, to represent and keepe better in minde that singular *sacrifice*, which can by no meanes be so liuely represented; as by the sacrificing of the selfe same things in substance, albeit after an other manner. Secondly, to conuey and apply the vertue of that on the Crosse, vnto all obedient Christians. For it is to be obserued, though Christ paid in his body the rancome of all sinners, and purchased Gods grace for them; yet, no man was thereby only freed from his sinnes and receiued into grace; but euery one must vse the meanes ordained by Christ, to be made partaker of that heavenly fauour. The Protestants hold faith alone to be the only meanes: but we more truly say, that the *Sacraments* and *Sacrifice* of the Masse, are principal conduict pipes, to conuey the streames of Gods grace into our soules, as shall be proued hereafter. The third cause, why wee must haue a *sacrifice*, to be offered daylie in the state of the newe Testament, is; that men may meete solcinnely at it, to doe their fealty and chiefe homage vnto God: which shall also in this question be proued more at large. Thus haue we briefly shewed, howe there is one absolute *sacrifice*, and howe after the same, there yet remaineth 2n other, which may be the better vnderstood, if we consider, that the vertue of Christes *sacrifice* on the Crosse, did vvorke the saluation of men, even from the beginning of the world: whereupon, Christ is called a *lambe*, slaine from the beginning.

Apoc. 13.
vers. 8. Now most euident it is, that notwithstanding the al-sufficiency of Christes only *sacrifice* on the Crosse, as well then in force, as now, there were both in the lawe of nature, and of *Moyse*, diuers other *sacrifices*; of which some were to purge from sinne: why therefore, may there not as well be one other since his passion? If their *sacrifices*, then, when Christes *sacrifice* on the Crosse was as present, and in as full force with God, could stand vvell with it, vvithout any derogation vnto the full vertue of it: vvhy cannot ours as well also doe so now? If you say, That Christ by one oblation hath con-

Hebr. 10.
vers. 14 summated or made perfect, them that be sanctified: therefore now there needeth

doeth no more. I answered (as before) that Christ by that same one *oblation*, obtained at his fathers handes, a generall pardon for all mankind; and all grace to be bestowed vpon them, euen from the beginning of the world, in such sort as he thought best: and that his one *oblation*, doeth no more exclude other *Sacrifices* since the time of his passion; then it did other *oblations* before, which all are as dependents on it, and meanes to keepe it fresh in memory; and to apply the vertue and meritt of that one *oblation*, vnto all men.

I vige yet further for the Protestants, to supply M. PERKINS negligence, and that this hard point may be the better vnderstood; and add out of S. Paul: *Where there is remission of these (iniquities) now there is no* *Ibidem* *oblation for sinnes.* *vers. 18.*

True, such an *oblation* as Christ offered on the Crosse; so *veruous*, to wipe away all iniquities; so *pretious*, to pay a generall ransome: but there may be an other available to entreate and deserue; that the vertue of the former generall, may be deriued vnto men in particular; because, although those sinnes and iniquities were vnto Christ pardoned in general: yet, at his death, or by it only, those sinnes were not remitted and pardoned vnto any man in particular; so that it was meete and requisite, that besides the *Sacrifice* to purchase that generall redemption; there should be an other, to apply the vertue of it in particular. And thus much of this argument: not that it deserued (as it was proposed nakedly by M. PER.) any more then a flat denial; but to explicate this difficulty, and to interpret some obscure places of S. Paul omitted by M. PERKINS.

M. PER. fifth reason: *If the Priest doe offer to God Christes reall body and blood, for the pardon of our sinnes; then man is become a mediator betweene God and Christ.*

This illation is too too ridiculous. Is he Christes mediator, that asketh forgiveness of sinnes for Christes sake? then are al Christians mediators betweene God and Christ: for we all present vnto God Christs passion, and beseech him (for the meritt thereof) to pardon vs our sinnes. I hope that we may both lawfully pray vnto God, and also imploy our best endeavours, that Christ may be truly knowne, rightly honoured and serued of all men, without inroaching vpon Christs mediation. These be seruices we owe vnto Christ, and the bounden duties of good Christians, wherein it hath pleased him to imploy vs, as his seruantes and ministers; not as his mediators. But Master PERKINS addeth, that we request in the Cannon of the Masse, *That God will accept our gifts and offerings (namely Christ himselfe offered) as he did the Sacrifices of Abell and Noe (he would haue said Abraham, for Noe is not there mentioned.)* True, in the sense

there following; not that this Sacrifice of Christes body, is not a thousand times more gratefull vnto him, then was the Sacrifices of the best men: but that this Sacrifice which is so acceptable of it selfe, may be vnto all the partakers of it, cause of all brauenly grace and benediction; and that also, through the same Christ our Lord; as it there followeth in the Canon.

His first and last reason, Is the judgement of the ancient Church, which is the feeblest of al the rest; for that he hath not one place, which maketh not *Cons. Tol.* flat against himselfe: heare and then judge. First (saith he) *A Countell* *12. cap. 5.* held at Toledo in Spaine, hath these wordes. Relation is made vnto vs, that certaine Priests, doe not so many times receiue the grace of the holy communion, as they offer Sacrifice: but in one day, if they offer many Sacrifices to God, they suspend themselves from the Communion.

Is not this a fit testimony to proue, that there is no Sacrifice of the Masse? whereas it teacheth the quite contrary, to wit: that there were at that time Priests that did offer Sacrifice daily; but were complained on and reproued, for that they did not themselves communicate of euery Sacrifice which they offered. *M. PAR.* bidderh vs marke, that the Sacrifice then, was but a kinde of seruice, because the Priest did not communicate. But why did not he marke, that they were therefore reprehended? as he well deserueth to be, for grounding his argument vpon some simple Priests abuse or ignorance.

Milenit. Secondly he saith, That in an other Countell, the name of Masse is put for a
cap. 12. forme of prayer. It hath pleased vs, that prayer, supplications, and Masses, which shall be allowed in the Countell, be vsed.

Ans. Very good: It is indeed that forme of prayer, which the Catholike Church hath alwayes vsed, set downe in the Missals or Masse-bookes, so that the Countell by him alleadged, doth allowe of Masse, Priests and Sacrifice: But (saith he very profoundly) Masse be compounded; but the Sacrifice propitiatory of the body and blood of Christ, admitteth no composition. This is so deepe and profound an obseruation of his, that I can scarce conjecture what he meaneth. The Masse (indeed) is a prayer composed of many parts; so (I weene) be all longer prayers; but in what sense can that be true, that the Sacrifice of Christ admitteth no composition? If he meane the passion of Christ on the Crosse, it was a bundell of Miseries and heape of sorowes, shames, and paines tyed together; and laid vpon the most innocent Lambe sweet IESVS: If he signifie their Lordes supper, doth it not consist of diuers partes, and hath it not many compositions in it? let the good man then explicate himselfe better, that one may be hearse at his reasoning; and then he shall be answered more particularly. But *Abbot Paschasius* shall mend all (hee should by his Title of *Abbot* seeme

OF THE SACRIFICE.

87

seeme rather likely to marre all) he saith, *Because we sinne daylie. Christ is L. de cor-*
sacrificed for vs mystically, and his passion is given vs in mystery. Very good: in
the mystery of the Masse, Christ is sacrificed for vs; not as he was on the
Crosse bloudily, but in mystery (that is) vnder the formes of bread and
wine: which may serue to answere al that he citeth out of Paschasius; spe-
cially considering, that in that whole treatise, and one or two other of the
same Authour, his principall butte and marke is, to proue the reall pre-
sence and Sacrifice. In the first Chapter of the booke cited by M. PER-
he hath these wordes: Our Lord hath done all thinges in heauen and earth, as he
will himselfe, and because it hath so pleased him, though the figure of bread and
wine be here (that is) in the Sacrament: notwithstanding it is to be beleened, that
after consecration, there is nothing else, but the flesh and bloud of Christ; vv
hich he also expressly proueth there at large. And in an other treatise of the
same argument, he hath these, among many such like wordes. Christ,
when he gaue his Disciples bread and broke it, did not say, this is a figure of my bo-
dy, nor in this mystery there is a certaine vertue of it: but he said without dissimu-
lation, This is my body, and therefore it is that which he said it was, and not that
which men imagine it to be. Did I not tell you that this Abbot vv as like to
helpe M. PER. but a lide? Thus at length we are come to the end of M.
PER. reasons in fauour of their cause, let vs heare what he produceth for
the Catholike party.

The first argument: *Christ was a Priest for euer, after the order of Melchi-*
sedecke: but Melchisedeckes order was to Sacrifice in bread and wine, there-
fore Christ did offer vp Sacrifice in formes of bread and wine at his last supper.

*Psal. 109.
ad Hebr.
5. & 7.*

And what Christ then did, that did he ordaine to be done to the worlds
end, by the Apostles & their successors: therefore there is now in the true
Church, a true and proper Sacrifice offered in our Lordes supper. To se-
perate that which is certaine from that which is in question: first, it is gran-
ted by all, that what Christ did in his last supper, that did he institute to be
done by his Apostles, Priests, and by his Ministers their successors for euer af-
ter: Also that Christ was a Priest according to the order of Melchisedeck;
because both these haue euident warrant in the written word. That then
which is to be proued, is, that this order of Melchisedeckes Priest-hood, doth
properly or principally consist, in the forme & manner of his sacrificing.
We say yea, M. PER. saith, no; and proueth it out of S. Paul, who shewing
Christ to be a Priest after the order of Melchisedeck, doth make no mention
of his Sacrifice; but compareth them together in many other points: as
that he was a King of justice, a Prince of peace, without Father and Mother, or
Genealogie; finally, that he took tithes of Abraham and blessed him: and in
these points only (saith M. PERKINS) standeth the resemblance.

Hebr. 7.

I ij.

Reph.

Repl. Not so; for that in none of these things doth any speciall order of Priest-hood consist: what his owne name or the name of his City doth signifie, are accidentall & incident thinges to Priest-hood; to receiue tithes and to blesse, belong to Priest-hood in deede; but generally to all sortes of Priest-hood, as well to the order of Aaron as to that of Melchisedecke; and therefore cannot distinguish one order of Priest-hood from another: Wherefore, it remaineth apparant that the proper order of Melchisedekes Priest-hood; must be gathered, not from any of those circumstances specified by the Apostle, but out of the very forme and manner of sacrificing, which is (as it were) the correlative of a Priest, and his proper function; as the

Cap. 5. *Apoll.* in the same Epistle defineth, where he saith: *That every high Priest is appointed to offer Sacrifices for sinnes.* Nowe, that both the order of Melchisedecke consisted in sacrificing bread and wine, and that therein Christ resembled him; let the learnedst and most holy ancient Fathers (no partial judges betweene vs, for they knewe neither of vs) be our arbitrators. Let vs heare first that famous Martyr *S. Cyprian*, vvho vpon those vvordes;

Lib. 2. *Epist. 3.* *Thou art a Priest for ever according vnto the order of Melchisedecke*, writeth thus: *Which order surely is this, proceeding of that Sacrifice and thence descending; that Melchisedecke was a Priest of the most high God, that he offered bread and wine, that he blessed Abraham. For who is rather a Priest of the most high, then our Lord Iesus Christ; that offered Sacrifice to God the Father, and did offer the same that Melchisedecke had offered, that is: bread and wine (so wit) his body and blood.* The same he repeateth in his treatise of our Lordes supper, saying: *That Sacraments signified by Melchisedecke, did then appeare, when our high Priest brought forth bread and wine, and said: This is my body.* Can any thing be more plaine?

Epist. 126 ad Enag. *S. Hierome* following the sentence of the most ancient Doctors, *Iereneus*, *Hippolitus*, *Ensebinus*, *Apollinaris*, and *Eustatius*, defineth the order of Melchisedecke to consist properly in this; that he offered not bloody sacrifices of beasts, as Aaron did; but in single bread and wine, being a cleane and pure Sacrifice, did prefigure and dedicate the Sacrament of Christ. The same doth he teach vpon the twenty first Chapter of *S. Matthewe*.

S. Augustine in diuers passages of his most learned workes, doth confirme the same most plainly: I will cite one. *In the old Testament there was a Sacrifice after the order of Aaron: afterward Christ of his body and blood ordained a Sacrifice, according to the order of Melchisedecke.*

He that desireth to see more of this point, let him reade *Theodore*, *Arnobius*, *Cassiodorus*, and all ancient commentaries vpon that verse of the Psalme. *Thou art a Priest for ever after the order of Melchisedecke*: and in like sort those who have written vpon the Epistle to the Hebrewes; and he

shall

shall find it, to be the generall resolute opinion of all antiquity, that Christ in his last supper did institute the Sacrifice of his body and blood, vnder the formes of bread and wine, according to the order of Melchisedecke.

But why then did not the Apostle (treating of this resemblance betwene Christ and Melchisedecke) make mention of this point of the Sacrifice? The reason is in readinesse, because it was not conuenient. First, it made not to his purpose, because he doth proue, that the order of Melchisedecke was more excellent then that of Aaron, which could not be proued by the Sacrifice of Melchisedecke in bread and wine, which were inferior vnto Beefes and Muttons, the sacrifices of Aaron. The second cause was the weakenesse of those Hebrewes faith, who were not then sufficiently instructed in Christes owne person, and in his Sacrifice on the Crosse, and therefore incapable of his Sacraments, and other mysteries thereupon depending; which the Apostle himselfe forewarneth, saying: *Of Melchisedecke we haue great speech and inexplicable, because you are become weak to beare. Therefore very absurdly doe the Protestants argue here* (as authenticall, as they speake in Schooles) thus: *The Apostle made no mention of this point of resemblance, therefore there is none, such*: whereas he himselfe told them before, that there were many profound points concerning Melchisedecke to be spoken off, which he omitted, because those Iewes were not (as yet) fit to heare them. And in truth, what could haue beene more out of season, then to haue spoken to them of the Sacrifice of the Masse (which is but a liuely resemblance of Christes death) vvhich were not then rightly informed of Christes death it selfe? He spake (saith S. Hierome) to the Iewes and not to the faithfull, to whom he might haue bene bold to utter the Sacrament. And thus much to this first euasion of M. PARKINS.

Nowe to the second: That (forsaith) Melchisedecke, did not sacrifice at all in bread and wine, but only brought forth bread and wine, to refresh Abraham and his souldiers; and is called a Priest there, not in regard of any Sacrifice, but in consideration of his blessing of Abraham; as the wordes teach (saith he) And he was a Priest of the most high, and therefore he blessed him.

Reply. He deserueth to be blessed with a cudgell, that darreth thus pervert the word of God. First, he addeth to the text this vword therefore: againe, where the point in the Hebrew text is at the end of this sentence, *He was a Priest of the most high*, he remoueth it to the end of the next clause, joyning that together which is separated in the text: Thirdly, the reason is friuolous, as M. PER. pointeth it. For it can be no good reason vwhy Melchisedecke was a Priest, for that he blessed Abraham: for Abraham was a Priest as well as he; and often offered Sacrifice, as well as Melchisedecke did. Nowe it standeth well, to declare why Melchisedecke brought forth bread

and wine, because he was a Priest that vsed to Sacrifice in that kinde; and to honour and thanke God for that victory, he either did then presently or before had sacrificed it; and as such sanctified food, made a present unto Abraham of it, who needed not, either for himselfe, or for his soldiers any victuals; because he returned laden with the spoile of foure Ringes: wherefore, the bread and wine that he brought forth, was a Sacrifice and not common meate. And if further prooffe needed, this is sufficiently confirmed by the Fathers already cited, who all teach, that bread and wine brought forth then by him, were Melchisedecks his Sacrifice, & a figure of ours. I will yet adde one more, out of that most ancient Patriarke

*L. 4. from
versus 10.
new.* Clement of Alexandria, who saith: Melchisedeck King of Salem, Priest of the most high God, gave bread and wine being a sanctified food, in figure of the Eucharist.

The Protestants feeling themselves, wonderfully pinched and wringed with this example of Melchisedeck, assay yet (to escape from it) a third way

For (saith M. P. R.) be it granted, that Melchisedeck offered bread and wine, and that was also a figure of the Lordes supper: yet should bread and wine, be as a types of no bread nor wine, but of the bare formes of bread and wine.

Reply. The thing prefigured must be more excellent then the figure, as the body surpasseth farre the shadowe: so albeit the figure were but bread and wine, yet the thing prefigured, is the body and blood of Christ vnder the formes of bread and wine, sacrificed in an vnbloudy manner, as bread and wine are sacrificed without shedding blood: and therein principally consisteth the resemblance. And thus much of our first argument. Nowe to the second.

The Paschall lambe was first sacrificed vp, by the Master of the family, and then afterward eaten as a Sacrament: but the Eucharist succeedeth in roome of that, as the verity doeth to the figure, therefore, it is first sacrificed before it be received.

M. P. R. first, denyeth the Paschall lambe to haue beene sacrificed: but yeeldeth no reason of his deniall, and therefore might without any further adoe be rejected. Yet fore-seeing that we might easily proue it, to be sacrificed by expresse Scripture (for Christ saith to his Disciples: Goe and prepare a place to sacrifice the passe-over, or Paschall lambe: also in Exodus Thou shalt sacrifice the lambe the foureteenth day of the Month, and in many other places) to this hath he nought els to say, but that Sacrifice in those places is taken improperly for to kill only. His reason is, because that in one place of Scripture, the word Sacrifice is taken (saith he) for to kill: but in more then one hundredeth, it is taken otherwayes, and that properly. Why then

should

*Mar. 14.
vers. 12.
Exod. 12.
vers. 6.*

OF THE SACRIFICE.

71

should we not take it there, as it doth vſually and properly ſignifie, rather then improperly? not any reaſon doth he render for that all: but becauſe it made ſo plaine againſt him, he muſt needes ſhift it off ſo wel as he could. But what if in the very place, where he ſaith it is taken for to kill only, and not for to Sacrifice, he be alſo deceiued? then hath he no colour to ſay, that in any place it is taken otherwiſe. Surely, the reaſon that he alleageth for it, is very inſufficient. For by *Iacobi* bretheren invited to his feaſt, may be vnderſtood according to the *Hebrewe* phraſe, men of his owne religion who might well come to his Sacrifice: wherefore, *S. Paul* calleth the *Romans*, *Corinthians*, and men of all nationis (that were Chriſtians) his bretheren. But if the *Paschall* lambe were not properly ſacrificed, howe could *S. Paul* reſemble *Chriſt* crucified, vnto the *Paschall* Sacrifice? ſaying 1. *Our* 1. Cor. 5.
Paschall lambe *Chriſt* is ſacrificed. Surely, that famous and ancient Martyr verſ. 7.
Iuſtine, vvho vvvas beſt acquainted vvith the rites of that people (himſelfe Dialog. cñ
being bredde and brought vp among them) ſaith moſt plainly, That the
killing of the *Paschall* lambe among the *Iewes*, was a ſolemne Sacrifice, and a
figure of *Chriſt*.

Wherefore, Maſter *Pan* vvill prouideth another anſwer to our argu-
ment, and ſaith That if it were granted, that the paſſe-ouer were both a Sa-
crifice and Sacrament: yet, would it ſhake much againſt them. For they may ſay,
that the ſupper of the Lord ſuccedeth it only in regard of the mayne end thereof,
which is to increaſe our communion vvith *Chriſt*.

What is this a Gods bleſſing? if that be all the vſe of it, the Lordes
ſupper may alſo bee no Sacrament at all: for many other thinges be-
ſides Sacraments increaſe our communion vvith *Chriſt*. But to the pur-
poſe: our Lordes ſupper, and alſo the *Paschall* lambe vvere inſtituted,
not only to increaſe our communion vvith *Chriſt*; but alſo to render
thankes to God for benefites receiued: as their *Paschall* for their deli-
uery out of the land of bondage, for our *Eucharist*, for our redemption
from ſinne and hell: and therefore, as they are Sacraments to feede our
ſoules; ſo are they true Sacrifices to giue thankes to God for ſo high
and ſingular benefites. And becauſe I loue not to leaue my reader in mar-
ter of diuinity, naked reaſons vvithout ſome authority; heare vvhat
S. Ambroſe ſpeaking of *Prieſts* miniſtring the Lordes ſupper, ſaith, vvhen
we doe offer Sacrifice, *Chriſt* is preſent. *Chriſt* is ſacrificed: for *Chriſt* our paſſe-
ouer is offered vp.

Lib. 1. Ro
Lucan.

S. Leo is yet more plaine, vvho ſpeaking of the paſſe-ouer, ſaith: Serm. 7.
That ſhadowes might giue place to the body, and figures to the preſent veri-
ty; the old obſeruaunce is taken away by the newe Teſtament: one Sacrifice
is turned to an other, and blood excludeth blood, and ſo the legall feaſt,
vvhiles

OF THE SACRIFICE.

whiles this changed is fulfilled. Marke howe the *Jew* succeeded in the Pasche lamb; the sacrifice of the Pasche being changed into the Sacrifice of Christs body. *Howe* *the Jew* succeeded in the Pasche lamb; the sacrifice of the Pasche being changed into the Sacrifice of Christs body.

Cap. 1.
vers. 11.

Our third argument is selected out of these vvordes of the Prophet Malachi: I will take no pleasure in you (saith the Lord of Hostes) and I will not receive a gift from your handes: for from the East unto the West, great is my name among the Gentils; and in every place a cleane oblation is sacrificed to my name. Hence we inferre, that after the reprobation of the *Jewes* and calling of the *Gentils* (that is in the state of the newe Testament) a cleane Sacrifice shall be offered unto God of the *Gentils*, being made Christians; as witnesse the spirit of God in the holy Prophet; ergo, it cannot be denied of Christians.

M. PERVINNE answereth, That by this cleane Sacrifice it is to be understood the spirituall Sacrifice of prayers; because that the apostle exhorting vs. to pray for all states; bath these wordes; Lifting vp pure hands and be able to guard.

What good Sir, are cleane hands and a cleane Sacrifice all one vwith you? a worshipfull exposition. This man conferreth places of Scripture very hand somely together, and would not doubt, write a faire Commentary vpon the text, if he were let along; but yet, tell me (I pray you) by the way, howe Christians can lift vp such pure hands, and offer to cleane a Sacrifice, if al their best workes be defiled with sinne, and no cleaner then a filthy menstruous cloute as you doe teach? But to confute him directly; our Lord speaketh thereto the *Priests* of the old lawe, and rebuketh them sharply; for their fault committed in their Sacrifices offered to him; and therefore foretelleth them, that he will reject al their Sacrifices, and accept of an other cleane Sacrifice among the *Gentils*. Nowe as Sacrifice in the former part of his speech is taken most properly, as no man can denie; so must it be in the latter; or else, there were a great equivocation in that sentence; and no plaine opposition of Sacrifice, to Sacrifice; cleane; to polluted. And if he had reprehended the *Jewes* for their vitious prayers, then had it beene correspondent to have said, that he would have received cleane prayers of others, in lieu of them; but in weighing against *Priests* and sacrifices in the very order and proportion of the sentence necessarily requirith; that for those evil *Priests*, and polluted sacrifices; he would establish good *Priests* and cleane sacrifices; according vnto the proper signification of the wordes. Againe, God is not so extremely bent against the *Jewes* nowe, but that he would receive the spirituall Sacrifice of prayer and thanks-giving, even from them, if they doe offer it; but he speaketh there of a kinde of Sacrifice that he will not receive from their handes; therefore, that Sacrifice cannot be understood; to be any such spirituall thing;

OF THE SACRIFICE.

74

There is and alwayes must be, a proper Sacrifice in the true Church. They doe deny that Christ offered any such Sacrifice in his last supper: we prove it thus, by his owne wordes: For he said; This dish which he gave them to eat, was euen then giuen for them to God: & that his blood was then presently shed for remission of their sinnes. But to offer his body and blood to God, by such a sacred action, and vnder such visible creatures to be there eaten, is properly to sacrifice, &c. Christ in his last supper did properly offer Sacrifice. They answer, that albeit it be said in the present tense; thus I giue and shedde: yet the meaning is, that it should be giuen only the morrowe after, on the Crosse; the present tense being put for the future: & further add, that in the Canon of the Masse, the verbe is put in the future tense.

Whereby, that men may not at their pleasure change tenses; or else the Iron might defend, that our host, was not yet borne: and if we pouerly say, ing; The Word is such as they may (by this licence of changing the present tense into the future) say; that it is not so yet; but it shall be hereafter: therefore, to lye vnto chopping and changing the text, without any reason or authority, is rather to shift off, then to defend a cause well. But (say they) it is in the Masse booke; & sufficient. God helpe the poore men, that louing the Masse no better, are driuen yet from the plaine text of holy Scripture, to flie to the Masse-booke for succour: but it will not serue their turne, because both are true, and agree vwell together. For Christes blood vnder the forme of wine, was presently sacrificed and shedde at his last supper; and the same in his owne forme, was to be shedde the morrowe after on the Crosse; and againe, vnder the forme of wine also, was to be shedde in the same Sacrament vnto the worldes end; so that truly & properly both may be said in the present tense, and it shall be shedde; and a good Interpreter of Scripture may not to deuide the one, from the other, but defend both, because both be the v wordes of the holy Ghost.

And the Greeke text in 1. Luke doth inuincibly confirme, that the wordes are to be taken in the present tense. For it hath; that the blood as in this Chalice, is powred out: Touto id poteron id eukynomenon. This Chalice is powred out: it cannot therefore, be referred vnto that powring out, which was to be made vpon the Crosse the day following; but to that that was powred out and out of the Chalice then presently. This might also be confirmed, by the blood which was sprinkled to confirme the old Testament vnto which his serueth that our Saviour did allude, in this consecration of the Chalice. For Moses said: This is the blood of the Testament; and our Saviour: This is the blood of the new Testament. But that blood which dedicated the old Testament, was first sacrificed to God: such therefore, was the blood of the new Testament. And to make the matter more cleare,

Luc. 22.

1. Thes. 4. 1

1. Thes. 4. 1

1. Thes. 4. 1

1. Thes. 4. 1

1. Thes. 4. 1

1. Thes. 4. 1

1. Thes. 4. 1

1. Thes. 4. 1

1. Thes. 4. 1

1. Thes. 4. 1

1. Thes. 4. 1

1. Thes. 4. 1

1. Thes. 4. 1

1. Thes. 4. 1

Luc. 22.

vers. 20.

Exod. 24.

vers. 8.

1. Heb. 9.

vers. 20.

for vs here hitherto the best and most judicious Fathers (vvhho received the right vnderstanding of the Scriptures, from the Apostles and their Schollers) doe take these vvordes of Christ. You haue heard already out of Lib. 4. S. Irenaeus, That Christ taught at his last supper, the newe Sacrifice of the newe Testament. And out of S. Cyprian, Christ offered there a Sacrifice. Lib. 2. his Father, after the order of Melchisedeck, taking bread and making it his body. And out of S. Augustine, Christ instituted a Sacrifice of his body and blood, according vnto the order of Melchisedeck, that is, vnder Conc. 2. the forme of bread and wine: I adde vnto them S. Chrysostome, vvho saith, Hom. 24. In steede of the slaughter of beasts, Christ hath commanded vs, to offer vp him- selfe. And againe a further Reuer in Paule, as an other Priest of menner Homil. 2. we must doe offer the holy Sacrifice, it is the same which Christ gaue to his Disciples, the which all Priestes now a dayes doe make; and this hath nothing Timoth. lesse than that. S. Gregory Nilene, Christ being both a Priest and the Lambe of God, offered himselfe a Sacrifice and Holt for vs. When vvvas this done? Euen then, when to his Disciples he gaue his body to eat, and his blood to drinke. Nilichius a first, our Lord supped with his Apostles, upon Lib. 2. in the figuratiue Lambe, and afterwards offered his owne Sacrifice. All these Leui. c. 8. and many other of the most ancient Fathers, could finde a proper and reall Sacrifice in Christs supper. To omit S. Gregories authority, and all other his inferiours for this last thousand yeares, vvho me the Protestants acknowledge, vvho ly to haue beleue and taught the Sacrifice of the Masse. See Henricus in euan. Concilio Trid. page 86. & 87.

To omit some other good arguments, made for vs out of the newe Testament, to retorne vnto M. PERKINS, vvho proposeth this as the fourth reason for our party out of S. Paul. We haue an Altar, vvhereof they may eat. vvho seru in the Tabernacle. Nowe say they, If we Christians haue an Altar, then must we consequently haue Priestes, and a proper kinde of Sacrifice: for these are correlatiues, and doe necessarily depend and followe one the other. M. PERKINS answereth, That the Altar there is to be taken not literally, but spiritually for Christ himselfe.

Repl. Obserue first, howe the Protestants are forced to flie from the plain sense of Scripture, and natieue signification of the vvordes, vnto a figuratiue & that without either reason or authority: secondly, I wish that M. P. would goe through with his paraphrase vpon the whole sentences, and by the Altar, how vnderstand Christ, then by eating of it, he will surely expound and beleue in Christ, now like a pretty Scholler that hath learned to read, lea him put it all together, & say, That we Christians haue a Christ, in vvhome the Iewes may not beleue: which is flat contradictory to that which the Apostle in that Epistle goeth about to perswade. * Lib. 6. in

and worthy Author, in expresse termes doth expound these wordes, of the *deare of Christs body*, which the *Leues* for their incredulity were not worthy to behold, much lesse to be partakers of it: and therefore the Apostle, to moue the *Leues* the rather to become Christians, signifieth: that so long as they *serue in the tabernacle* and continue *Leues*; they deprive themselves of that great benefite, which they might haue, by receiving the blessed Sacrament. Nowe the wordes following in the text, which M. P. hath chosen to interpret this sentence, belong nothing to it, but containe another reason to induce the *Leues* to receiue Christ for their *Messias*, drawne for a circumstance of their *Sacrifice*; thus as the bodies of their *Sacrifices*, were burnt without the Camp, & Christ suffered without the gate and city of *Jerusalem*, and therefore, Christ was then worth preferred by their *Sacrifices*. It hath also an exhortation to depart out of the society of the *Leues*, and to forgoe all the preferment and glory they might enjoy among them, & to be content to suffer with Christ and contemne it. Briefly, there is no one word in the sentence before, to proue the *Leues* to be taken for Christ; but for a materiall *shew*, vpon which the Christian *Priests* did offer the body and blood of Christ in the blessed Sacrament; which may be confirmed by that passage of the same Apostle: *You cannot drinke the cup of our Lord; and the cup of Demits; You cannot be partaker of our Lords table and the table of Demits; here a comparison is made betwixt our Sacrifice and table, and the Sacrifice and table of Idols; the meaning first, that he who communiceth with the one of them, cannot be partaker of the other; and then, that he who drinketh of the blood of the Sacrifice, is partaker of the Sacrifice.* Nowe, the comparison were improper, if our cup were not the cup of a Sacrifice; as there was no other table a true Altar, as there was none of all doubt. And that list of *Kennidias* is not cleanly, who saith: *I thinke, who drinke of Christs cup, are partakers of his Sacrifice on the Crosse, but not of any Sacrifice there present.* For S. Pauls comparison is taken from the cup of a Sacrifice; to Idols immediately before offered; so that it doth conuince, our Chalice to be the cup of a Sacrifice, then presently immolated and offered vpon the Altar.

The six objection with M. P. (which is our six argument) is this; *Where alteration is both of lawe and covenant, there must needs be a new Priest and a new Sacrifice; which is grounded vpon S. Pauls wordes, who saith: That the Priest hood being translated, it is necessary that a translation of the lawe be made; but in the newe Testament, there is alteration of both lawe and covenant; therefore there are both newe Priests and a newe Sacrifice.* M. P. answereth, that all may be granted, That there are both newe Priests and a newe Sacrifice: *Mary, no other Priest, but Christ himselfe both God and man, who*

an answer to the Sacrifice; and so God the Almighty and Most high, and most good
 to Reply: Who ever heard such a proper piece of divinity? Is the God-
 head in Christ the Altar, vpon which he offereth? (then it is not only infe-
 rior vnto God the Father, to whom the Sacrifice is offered, but the God-
 head in Christ is inferior to his man-hood; as the Altar is inferior vnto the
 Sacrifice and Priest. Again, the man-hood in Christ being separated from
 the God-head, is not as a sacrifice of himselfe, vnto and consequently; not
 sufficient to satisfy for all the sinnes of the world, so that nothing could be
 answered more abundantly. But his meaning (perhaps) was, That Christ
 sacrificing himselfe vnto the Crosse, remaineth a Priest for ever; and is the only
 Priest of the new Testament, in his own person; and maketh himselfe a sacrifice
 vnto the Crosse, and by his death, redeemeth us from all iniquity, and offering of
 Reply: Christes Sacrifice on the Crosse, is common as well vnto all the
 faithful, that liued before his daies, euen from the beginning of the world;
 as vnto all that liued since; as effectual and present vnto the one, as vnto
 the other; and therefore is he said to be the Lamb slain from the beginning
 of the world; so that notwithstanding that his sacrifice remaineth in
 his full force and vertue, that besides that sacrifice vnto the Crosse, which is
 common to all; we must needs haue both new and old sacrifices and Se-
 crifices; because we haue a new lawe and covenant: for Christes Sacrifice
 on the Crosse, is no more actually present vnto vs, then it was vnto the
 Iewes; and all they were before him. And as touching the effect and benefit
 of that his Sacrifice; it was imparted and communicated, as well vnto old
 Father Abraham; as vnto any that liued, or doth liue in the state of the newe
 Testament; and consequently, the Sacrifice on the Crosse, is not that pe-
 culiar Sacrifice, which goeth joyndly with the newe Testament. Which
 argument may be confirmed by this; that there was neuer any lawe or re-
 ligion in antiquity, without their proper Sacrifices, and without a true and
 real Sacrifice: where vpon it followeth, that the very naturall light of mans
 vnderstanding doth teach vs, that God is alwayes to be worshipped with
 Sacrifice. Neither proceedeth this out of the naturall conception of men;
 (as *Kantius* is not ashamed to say), but from the deepe consideration of
 mans bounden duty towards God. For the holiest and best informed
 men in the lawe of nature, as *Abel, Noe, Melchisedech, Iacob, Isaac, and*
Isaac, and often & most devoutly offer vp Sacrifices vnto God: and in the
 lawe of *Moses*; God himselfe prescribed vnto his people of *Israel*, diuers
 and sundry kindes of Sacrifices; for his redemption, as a way impudent
 assertion to say, that to Sacrifice vnto God, is a diuine ordinance of the corruption of
 mans nature. And further, the very nature and end of a Sacrifice doth con-
 uince, that it is to be offered vnto God in all states and times. For what is a

Sacrifice, but the most sovereign honour, that man can externally exhib-
 ite to his Almighty by not only using, but consuming some thing of
 price, to present God to his omnipotent Author of all things, and to
 his creatures receiving and holding our lives, and all our goodes (of both
 soule and body) of him. And if I may saye me, whether it be not sufficient
 to do this in hart inwardly, and inwardly to professe it in wordes, I am a
 soverey that is not; but we must besides thoughts and wordes, by actual
 all deedes expresse the same. And the act of sacrificiing, by the consent
 of the best learned of all Nations, hath bene and is approved and decla-
 red, for the only outward act of divine honour proper unto the *Deity*.
 Saint Augustine teacheth us, that the erecting of Altars, the consecrating of
 Priests, and offering of Sacrifice, be things properly belonging unto
 God, and like Christians (indeed) in memory of their Masters, did these
 things: but yet, they did them only unto God; and that the *Pagan* them-
 selves, did not honour any dead or alive with Sacrifices, but such as they
 esteemed to be Gods; so that if we Christians, should have a true and
 proper sacrifice, we should be like the heathen, who were wont to offer
 beeing the best of all principall and chiefest part of true religion. And is
 it credible, that God should aime vs only (in some he hath chosen to
 serve him most excellently) unto the sovereign point of his divine ho-
 nous, surely not; wherefore in this our doctine of a true sacrifice, he lay
 offered to God, is the foundation of the foundation of religion, as the heathen
 (as Mr. de Witteth) say, upholdeth the principall pillar of religion: and
 they in denying of it, do (as he) strike of the head of Christian reli-
 gion. And who would so meane wile, that (seeing their filthy shifts and last
 refuge of Christs sacrifice on the crosse, to be thought last wordes that men
 soiled could vnderstand, for any reason to be held, that there must be a daily sa-
 crifice dayly offered by some special persons, whereat the rest of Christi-
 ans must be assembled, and inuent to doe their fealty and homage, unto the
 sovereign Lord of heauen and earth; that God be not defrauded of that
 his supreme service. Nowe it is most manifest, that Christs Sacrifice on
 the crosse, was a once offered sacrifice, and being once past, can be no such
 bodie as that which is offered: Christians therefore to performe any such du-
 ty: wherefore, cannot be the daylie Sacrifice which we Christians are to
 offer. Becomes in bloody shew of his body and blood, and the formes
 of bread and wine, is the most excellent sacrifice (as that on the Crosse)
 that is now, as containing the substance of his body and blood; and being a
 most pure representation of his death and passion: and therefore, by
 Christs own institution it was established, as fittest for the perfect state
 of the new Testament, and ordained, that it alone should be in stead of all

Li. 2. cōt.
 Faustum.
 cap. 21. &
 de civitat.
 Ori. lib. 8.
 cap. 29. &
 l. 2. c. 10.
 & alibi.

offereth, in whose it given for them. And a little after: *When our Sacrifice of the Altar is offered, of whom it given for the foules of the baptised departed for the very good foules, they are thankes-giving: for them that dyed in very cruel, they are means to obtayne mercy: for others that dyed in very cruel estate, though they be no helpe to them so dead; yet are they consolation unto the living.*

Catech. 5. *St. Cyril Patriarke of Hierusalem teacheth thus: We do beleue, that the intercession of the holy and precious Sacrifice, which is offered for the dead, doth much helpe their soules for whom it is offered.*

Lib. 1. 20. *St. Ambrose, comforting Constantine for the death of his sifter, Richinthe, thinketh not to be so much lamented, as to be prayed for; nor her soules to be grieved with thy teares, but rather to be recommended to God by Sacrifice.*

Epist. 8. *St. Chrysostome doth manerously witness by the Apostles, that the dead are benefitted by their sacrifice, and that it is a great commendation to God.*

Hom. 40. *St. Chrysostome doth manerously witness by the Apostles, that the dead are benefitted by their sacrifice, and that it is a great commendation to God.*

L. 4. vita *St. Chrysostome doth manerously witness by the Apostles, that the dead are benefitted by their sacrifice, and that it is a great commendation to God.*

Constant. cap. 71. *St. Chrysostome doth manerously witness by the Apostles, that the dead are benefitted by their sacrifice, and that it is a great commendation to God.*

Lib. 1. 1. *St. Chrysostome doth manerously witness by the Apostles, that the dead are benefitted by their sacrifice, and that it is a great commendation to God.*

Epist. 9. *St. Chrysostome doth manerously witness by the Apostles, that the dead are benefitted by their sacrifice, and that it is a great commendation to God.*

By which he giueth vs to vnderstand, that for the foules of the dead, as well as for the foules in Purgatory, as for the living.

*To be short, it was defined and declared by the Catholike Church in her prime time, that it was an heresie to denie, that Sacrifice was to be offered for the dead: as Epiphanius doth testifie in *Anchirastol.* St. Augustine in *De ciuitate dei*, lib. 8. c. 2. Damascene in *De fide orthodoxa*, c. 3. So that the thing is as euident, as the sun.*

This much of the Sacrifice of the Masse.

OF

OF FASTING.

OVR CONSENTS.

M. PERKINS Page 221.

Our consent may be set downe in three conclusions. First, we doe not condemne fasting, but maintayne three sortes of it, to wit: a morall, a ciuill, and a religious fast. A morall fast is a practise of sobriety or temperance, when as in the vse of meates and drinckes, the appetite is restrayned, that it doe not exceede moderation: and this must be vsed of all Christians, in the whole course of their liues. A ciuill fast is, when vpon some politike consideration men abstayne from certaine meates: as in our common weale, the lawe enioyneth vs to abstayne from flesh at certaine seasons of the yeare, for these speciall endes; to preserue the breede of cattall, and to maintayne the calling of fisher-men.

Obserue by the way, that if he meane the fast of Lent (as it is most likely by his wordes) he is fouly deceiued in the speciall endes of it; which are not those worldly respects by him mentioned, but principally others more spirituall and heavenly, to wit: First, the punishment of our owne flesh, for the faulces committed in ouermuch eating the whole yeare before; as more deeply of our Lodes death and resurrection: thirdly, to dispose and make vs more worthy to receiue the blessed Sacrament, which euery Christian is bound to receiue about Easter. Briefly, to omit diuers other causes; we fast the Lent to imitate (as neare as our frailty doth permit) our soueraigne Lord and Master, who fasted fourty dayes: so that to reduce the fast of Lent vnto a ciuill fast, principally; is to preferre earthly respects before heavenly. We denie not, but that many times spirituall exercises, doe bring with them temporall commodities; but those are incident and accidentary vnto them, nor the speciall causes of them: and in Countries farre distant from the Sea, vvhich are no such fisher-men, the Lent is obserued as dulie as in our Iland, inuironed with the Sea.

Nowe to the third kinde of fasting, maintayned by M. PER., but seldome practised by his followers, which he calleth religious: because the duties of religion (as the exercise of prayer and humiliation) be practised during the time of this fast. But he doth amisse, to put this for one of the points of our agreement: for vve esteeme fasting it selfe (vvhich it is done, to appease Gods wrath, and to honour him in our humiliation) to be an essentiall part of

Gods worshippe; which the Protestants denie, and say: that fasting is only tearmed religious, because during the time of it, by prayers and preaching, and such like, they worshippe God: but so the very time, and place it selfe may be tearmed also religious, and many other such odde thinges; because they doe also concurre with actes of religion.

Let vs come to his second conclusion, to wit: *We joyne with them in allowance of the principall and right endes of a religious fast, and they are three. The first, that thereby the minde may become attentive in meditation of the duties of Godlines, to be by vs performed. The second, that the rebellion of the flesh may be subdued: for the flesh pampered, becometh an instrument of licentiousnesse. The third, and (if he mistake not) the chiefe end of a religious fast, is, to professe our guiltinesse, and to testifie our humiliation before God for our sinnes: and for this end in the fastes of the Niniuites, the very beasts were made to abstayne.*

Hitherto Master PERKINS.

We besides the three afore-said endes, adde diuers others: as to punish & chastrate our flesh for former offences, which is an act of justice: to obey the Churches commandement, which is a religious obedience; and at this time it may be an act of professing the Carolike faith, when we obserue set fastings, to make profession of our faith: and to fast, thereby to imitate and please our head Christ Iesus, is an act of perfect charity.

But let vs returne vnto M. PERKINS third conclusion, which is: *We yeeld vnto them, that fasting is a helpe and furtherance vnto the worshippe of God: yea, and a good worke also (if it be vsed in good manner), allowed of God, and to be highly esteemed of all the seruants of God.*

All this is good: but whereas he saith that fasting in it selfe, is a thing indifferent; he abuseth the name of fasting, taking it to signifie all manner of abstinence from meate and drinke: and so (in deede) it is in it selfe indifferent, & may be either good or badde, as if one should abstaine from food to pine himselfe away. But fasting being properly taken, signifieth an abstinence from meate, according vnto some seruile of the Catholike Church; the better to please and serue God: and so it is of it selfe, an act of the true worshippe of God.

THE DIFFERENCE.

MAfter PERKINS: Our dissent from the Church of Rome in the doctrine of fasting, standeth in three points: First, about the set time of fasting: Secondly, about the manner of abstinence, and what meate is to be eaten on fasting dayes: Thirdly, about the vertue and value of fasting. Concerning the first The Catholikes appoint and prescribe set times of fasting as necessary to be kept: We hold that no set ordinary time is to be appointed, but that the Governours of the Church, may sometimes vpon certain occasions, enioyne a religious fast. Our reasons

sons be these. First, when the disciples of Iohn asked Christ why they and the Pharisees fasted often, but his Disciples fasted not; he answered, Can the children of the marriage-chamber mourne; as long as the Bridegrome is with them? but the dayes will come, when the Bridegrome shall be taken from them, and then shall they fast: where be gineth them to vnderstand, that they must fast as occasions of mourning are offered. Whence also I gather, that a set time of fasting is no more to be enioyned, then a set time of mourning.

And this is all the reasons which M. PER. maketh for their opinion, except the record of antiquity, of which afterward. This reason of his, as also the other testimonies following, are so formall for him and fit for his purpose; that they doe much more proue the cleane contrary. For first, (admitting M. PER. collection, that there must then be a set time of fasting, when there is a set time of mourning) I inferre thereupon, and that exprelly out of that text; That when the Bridegrome is taken from vs, then is the time of mourning: but that hath beene euer since Christes Ascension to heauen; for then was Christ our Bridegrome taken from vs: therefore, euer since Christes Ascension, there was alwayes or ought to haue beene, a set time of fasting in the Church. And this reason, did the ancient Christians with *De jejunijs* Terullian yeeld, of their yearly fasting of Lent. With vvhome S. Augustine agreeth, saying: Nowe therefore, because the Bridegrome is taken away from vs, we the children of that beautifull Bridegrome, must mourne; and that for good cause, if we ardently desire to be in his company: so that the same place, vvwhich M. PERKINS alleageth against a set time of fasting, doth (taken euen in the very sence that he taketh it) demonstrat the flat contrary. He further citeth out of antiquity two testimonies, vvwhich make as evidently against himselfe. The first out of S. Augustine, vvho hath these vvordes: I diligently considering thereof, in the Euangelicall and Apostolicall letters, and in all that instrument which is called the newe Testament, I see, that fasting is commanded: but in what dayes we ought not to fast, and on what we ought, I doe not finde it determined by the commandements of our Lord; or of the apostles. Hence inferreth Master PERKINS, That Augustine was of opinion that there was no set times of fasting. But the man hereas else vvhere, sheweth himselfe to haue no conscience: for in the very same Epistle S. Augustine teacheth, that all the Church fasted at that time, every Wednesday and Friday through the yeare: and admitteth S. Peter, and the rest of the Apostles, to haue beene the founders of that set and ordinary fast. And in his Epistle he giueth the reason, vvhy we fast fourty dayes before Easter: and againe he saith, That the fast of Lent was by the consent of all men, obserued ouer all the world, every yeare most diligently. What (therefore) could be further from this most

circumspect and judicious Doctors minde, then to thinke or teach, that there vvas no certayne time of fasting to be obserued? true it is, that he found not expressly in holy Scripture, this certaine time defined. And note that repeating the same wordes againe towards the end of the said epistle, he addeth thereto these two wordes, to wit: *in those Scriptures* (which be properly so called) he did not finde it evidently defined, vvhath dayes vve are to fast. Which word evidently, he addeth (as I take it) because that els where he saith, that *the fourty dayes fast of Lent, hath authority as out of the old lawe, so out of the Gospell; because our Lord fasted so many dayes, and by his example consecrated it, as he saith: so that finally, we find with S. Augustine* M. PER. first witness, some dayes every weeke of set fasting, and once in the yeare a soleinne set fast of fourty dayes together.

*Epist. 119
cap. 15.
Serm. 64.
de temp.*

*Cont. Pj-
chicos.*

M. PERKINS other Authour is *Tertullian*, in his booke against sensuall men; wherein he is so farre opposite to M. PER. opinion, that he runneth into the other extremity. The Protestants would haue no set time of fasting, not so much as one Lent: *Tertullian* pleading for the *Montanists* would haue three Lents every yeare; and a farre stricter kinde of fasting, then the *Catholike* Church commandeth. But the Goodman (perhaps) mistaking his Authour, would haue said; that *Catholikes* (as *Tertullian* reporteth) did argue against his error, and said: that it vvas a newe doctrine which he taught; and that true Christians were at their liberty, and not bound to receiue such newe inuentions of *Montanus* about fasting, though he vaunted, that he had that doctrine from the holy Ghost. But in this point we must not hearken vnto *Tertullian* a Patron of that error: nor beleue his reportes of the *Catholikes* arguments against him, which he (after the fashion of *Heretikes*) doth frame, and propose odioussly.

*Li. 5. bish.
cap. 17.*

But *Eusebius* saith, that *Montanus* was the first, that made lawes of fasting.

See the place (gentle reader) either in the *Greek* or *Latin* text, except that of *Basil*, and thou shalt finde there these only vvordes, cited out of *Apollonius*: That *Montanus* made newe lawes of fasting, not that he vvas the first that made any lawes of fasting; but was noted as an *Heretike* for making newe lawes of fasting. Whence it plainly followeth, that there were other old lawes of fasting before his time, which contented not his humour; but taking pride in his owne inuention (as all *Heretikes* doe) he was not satisfied with one Lent, but would haue three Lents every yeare: and vpon every fasting day, commanded all his adherents to touch nothing, vntill the Sunne were set; and then they should eate neither flesh nor fish, nor ought else hotte or moist; but cold, drie, and hard thinges. For which his ouer rigorous and stearne kinde of fasting, inuented by him,

himselfe and obstinately defended, he vvas condemned for an *Heretike*; and his newe precepts of fasting rejected by the ancient Christians: and this may serue for a confutation of M. PERKINS reasons for their party. Nowe I vvil briefly confirme ours, vvhich he setteth downe by manner of objections. First, in the old Testament there vvere prescribed and set *Leuit. 16.* *fastes*, approved by God, which M. PERKINS confelleth, *in haue haene part of vers. 22.* *the legall worshippe*, and saith: *That God commanded these fastes, but none hath left vs to our liberty.*

Reply. God hauing commanded fasting as a part of his worshippe then, (as M. PERKINS confelleth) it being no iudiciall or ceremoniall part of the lawe, but morall, and appertayning to the maistring of euery mans owne vnbrieded concupiscence, he did sufficiently teach all considerate men, that it was alwayes to be vsed for part of his worshippe, for that alwayes men should stand in neede of it, they being alwayes subiect to the same rebellion of their flesh. And though we be freed from all vncleane meates of the lawe, and from the *Iewes* set times of fasting: yet, the band of fasting remaineth, because the reason of it is still in force; and we are subiect to the Pastours of the Church, and bound to obey them, for the time and manner of our fasting.

Our second argument. The Gouvernours of the Synagogue had full power and authority to prescribe set times of fasting, and all the people of God vvere bound to obey them therein, as appeareth in the Prophet *Zachary*, who maketh mention of the fastes of the fourth, fift, eight and ninth Monethes; which were not commanded by the lawe, but afterward enjoyed by the rulers of the Church. Nowe then, if the Pastours of that Synagogue had such authority, much more haue the Prelates of the church nowe since Christes time, who hath indured them with much more ample authority, then the *Iewes* had before Christ. M. PERKINS answereth, that those fastes mentioned in *Zachary*, were appointed vpon occasions of the affliction of the Church in Babilon, and ceased vpon their deliuerance.

Reply. The Prophet in the same place hath plainly prevented this answer: for he saith, *That they then in the beginning of that captiuitie, had already fasted frequently*; and addeth, *That they should continue those fastes, untill the Gentils should joyne with them in faul*, vvhich was for foure hundred years after. Adde herewith, a fast & feast appointed at the instance of the most vertuous Queene *Hester* and good *Mardochai*, to be alwayes afterward obserued by the *Israelites*, in remembrance of their preservation.

The third argument. Although in the newe Testament, there be no euident testimony for a set time of fasting, (as *S. Augustine* saith) yet there is some mention made of a set time of fasting: *Where as nowe it is not safe saying*

saying, because the fast now we was past. True it is, that some doe expound this of the *Iewes* set fast in the Moneth of *September*; but that exposition is not so probable: for after that time of the year (especially in those hot countries) it is very safe sailing; and therefore, it cannot so well be understood of that season. Again *S. Luke* wrote the acts of the Apostles, rather for the *Gentils* then for the *Iewes*, he being a companion of the Doctor of the *Gentils*; and therefore it is more probable, that he describeth the set fast of the *Christian Gentils*, which was in the moneth of *December*, now called *ember dayes*, when ordinarily *Priester* and other ecclesiasticall persons were consecrated; as may be seene in the pontiffical of *Pope Damasus*, who lived one thousand two hundred yeares past. And this season of the year, agreeth well with the text: for about, and after that time, it is perilous sailing, the seas and windes growing bigge and tempestuous.

Epist. 86. The fourth argument, out of *S. Augustine* before alleadged. The Apostles instituted *wednesdayes* and *fridayes* to be fasted every weeke; the which *Epiphanius* also confirmeth; and it is touched in the 68. Canon of the Apostles; so that it is an Apostolicall ordinance to fast every weeke. Besides, the fast of foure daies before *Easter* called *Lent* to be an Apostolicall Tradition, *S. Hierome*, and *S. Leo*, doe in expresse termes declare; and mention is made of it in the Councell of *Nice*; and in *S. Ignatius*, the Apostles

Harq. 75 disciple. Finally, *Acrim* the Heretike unto the *Arrians* heresie, addeth this error (as witnesseth *S. Augustine*) that prescribed for fasts, were not so solemnly observed, but that every one should fast when he would himselfe; least we should

Epist. 54 ad *Marcel. serm.* *disciple.* Finally, *Acrim* the Heretike unto the *Arrians* heresie, addeth this error (as witnesseth *S. Augustine*) that prescribed for fasts, were not so solemnly observed, but that every one should fast when he would himselfe; least we should

6. de Quat. drag. *Ad Quat. drag.* seeme to be under the law. Behold *M. P.* very opinion plainly condemned for heresie, 1200. yeares agoe: yea, before that time almost 100. yeares, it was recorded for an heresie, by that Godly and learned Bishop *Epiphanius*.

75. 53. Before I end this point I may not forget *M. P.* owne objection against him selfe, that (forsooth) some reformed Churches of the Protestants (who cannot erre in his opinion) observe set dayes of fasting. He granteth that they doe so indeed, but not upon necessity or for conscience sake; but for politike regard; where as the Church of *Rome* holdeth it to be sinne, to desert the set time of fasting, till the next day.

25. Apply. This answer, first imployeth a notable error; that Protestants are not bound in conscience to obey their ciuill Magistrates lawes, which

Rom. 13. *S. Paul* expressly condemneth, saying: Therefore be subject of necessity, not only for wrath, but also for conscience sake. Wherefore, the ciuill Magistrates commanding a set fast, the Protestants must of necessity and for conscience

vers. 5. sake obserue it; or else, they commit the sinne of disobedience at the least. But besides this absurdity, there is an other lesse, contained in this answer: For I doe aske whether the Protestants lawe of set fasting be good

and allowable or no; If good (as *M. P.* graunteth) then Christians surely

are bound to keepe it; because they are bound to obey their Gouernors in good matters: and consequently, their liberty of eating may be abridged by their Superiors lawes, by their owne confession: wherefore, they must either condemne their owne Magistrates lawes for nought worth or else, whether they will or will not, allowe of ours. And that excuse of the diuersity of endes, is not to purpose. For if the Magistrates may for a euill respect, restraints our liberty: much more may they doe it for a religious; which is of a higher nature, and more forcible to bind our consciences.

Now to the second point of difference. Where M. P. findeth fault with two petty imperfections in the manner of our fasting, before he cometh to the greatest, to wit: with the permission to drinke water, wine, or eleuaries upon fasting daies; & with the eating of one meale, at, or about noone-tide: which he disproueth first; because it is contrary to the practise of the old Testament.

Indic. 20.
vers. 26.
& 2. Sa-
muel 1.
vers. 13

To which we answer: first, that there is no mention made at all of drinking wine or water, or of not drinking: wherefore, to that part, it is altogether impertinent. And to speake a word by the way, of drinking of wine upon fasting dayes; it was wholly forbidden in the East Church, where the countries being exceeding hotte, water alone might be drunk without danger of health. In other countries somewhat colder, which haue no other drinke but wine and water, as it is in *Spain*, *Italy*, and in that climate where *Nauarra* liued; there, wine is permitted on fasting daies, & vsed in the winter season specially; but yet, well tempered with water. But in *England* and in other like places, where we haue beere: there to drinke much wine on fasting daies, is not tollerable. Touching the other point, of eating the meale about noone-tide, I grant that the *Israelites*, in the two places cited by M. P. did fast till euening: but we are not bound to conforme our selues to that their fasting. First, because it was an extraordinary fast; and so being but once vsed, might easier be borne for one day. Secondly, mens bodies were in those daies stronger, & better able to beare out a long fast, then they are at these: and therefore, our discret & deare Mother the *Catholike Church*, condescending vnto the infirmity of her tender children, doth not exact more then they are wel able to performe, without danger of health. And therefore, albeit in the primitive Church generally, when men were stronger both in spirit and body, the lawe & custome was to fast, vntill three of the clocke in the after-noon: notwithstanding, in these later daies, when men are growne weaker, the Church doth not exact any more of vs, then to fast vntill noone, though she like those better, who (being wel able) doe fast longer. Nowe to the maine point of difference of meates.

The *Catholikes*, (saith Master PERKINS) allowe only white-meate on their fasting daies (yea, they allowe not so much neither in Lepr, but only fish)

and

And that of necessity and for conscience sake:

True. All Catholikes hold themselves bound in conscience, to obey the lawes of their Superiours in these cases, if they be able; if not, to aske leave of their Pastours, to eate that which will serue their turne. But (saith Mr. Parr. out of the presumption of his owne wisdom) we hold this distinction of meates to be both foolish and wicked.

Good wordes Sir (I pray you) for (be it spoken without your disparagement) farre wiser and better men then your selfe, haue bene and are of an other opinion. But he will proue his assertion so mightily, that no man shall be able to gaine say it. Let vs heare him.

First, it is foolish (saith he) because in such meates as they prescribe, there is much filling and delight, as in flesh: namely in fish, fruites, and wine.

Howe proueth he this? Neither by reason, nor yet by any authority of either fool or phisicion: and therefore we must needs take him for an odde wiseman, that so lightly vpon his owne phantasie only, durst condemn the constant opinion of all Christians of many hundred yeares for foolish and wicked. But, pleaseth it you to vnderstand (good Sir) that, although there were no difference in the meates; yet, the commandement of our Pastours (being to refraine from the one, and not from the other) were sufficient to make a distinction of meates, and to binde vs to abstaine from them, without any touch of folly. For what difference for delight or filling, was there betweene the forbidden fruite of Paradise and other fruites? Yet, because contrary to commandement, our first parents *Adam* and *Eve* did eate thereof, they became both foolish & wicked: therefore, it is no foolish part to obserue a distinction of meates, vwhen it is so appointed by our Gouernours.

To confute him more fully, let vs heare what reason our Pastours had to prescribe such a distinction of meate, fasting being specially instituted to bridle and subdue the vnlawfull desires of the flesh, it was most meete that we should refraine from eating of flesh on fasting dayes; because that the eating of flesh, doth more nourish and pamper vp our flesh, then the eating of fish. For flesh, both in it selfe is more nourishing, as being of a more warme substance and fuller of ioyce, then fish: and againe, it is more like vnto our substance, and so more apt to feed it, and consequently, to make it (like a well fedde horse) more proude and ready to resist reason: and therefore, our Prelates had great cause to forbid eating of flesh, when they would haue vs to tame our flesh by fasting. If some dainty fish be more agreeable vnto some appetites, then some kinde of grosse meate, that is not materiall: For in comparisons if they be equall, the best of the one must be compared with the best of the other, and not the worst of one

sort;

fort, with the best of the other. Now, ouermuch filling of our bellies with
 meate, as ouercharging of our heads with drinke, and hunting after dain-
 ty cares; are, by the very light of nature condemned, and so there needed
 no newe inhibition against them: but the only thing that remained indis-
 ferent, was the distinction of meates; wherein the wisdom of the Church
 hath greatly shewed her selfe; which, to make our fast more agreeable vn-
 to the proper end of it (that is to tame the flesh) hath enjoyned vs to ab-
 staine from flesh. And this was obserued and collected out of the practise
 of her most wise, holy, and Godly children. For the Prophet *Dauid* when
 he did fast very deuotely; abstayned, as from all dainties; so from flesh
 and wine. *S. Iohn Baptist* (the perfect parente of mortification of fleshly
 concupiscence) did neuer eat any flesh: but wilde honey, and locustes were
 his food. *S. Petrus* (as that worthy Doctor *Negrius* can report) did
 commonly eat but a certayne kinde of pulse. *S. Mathew* ate no flesh, but
 beebes, fruite, and rootes; as *Clement* Patriarke of *Alexandria* hath regi-
 stred. *S. Iames* (as *Eusebius* rehearseth) neuer ate flesh, nor dranke wine:
 the like he relecth out of *Philon* in the same booke, of those most blessed
 Christians of *Alexandria*, gouerned by *S. Marke* the Euangelist. A man
 may finde very many like examples in antiquity: but that precisely vpon
 falling dayes in Lent, we must abstayne from flesh, these Doctors by
 name doe teach: *S. Basil*, *S. Chrysostome*, *Cyril Hieron.*, *S. Augustine*,
S. Hierome. These most Godly and most iudicious Fathers, and (with
 all) best acquainted with the managing of spiritual affaires, are (I hope)
 rather to be hearkened vnto, in the matter of distinction of meates, and to
 be esteemed more expert therein, then a million of our fleshly Ministers
 (whose belly seemeth to be their God) that may in no case abide to be a-
 bridged of the bodily pleasures. But to proceede.
 You haue hitherto heard howe faintly *M. PARKINS* hath proued this
 distinction of meates to be foolish: nowe you shall see, howe he doth de-
 monstrate it to be wicked. He (saith he) taketh away the liberty of Christians,
 by which vnto the pure, all thinges are pure: and the Apostle biddeth vs to
 stand fast in this liberty, which the Church of Rome would thus abolish.
 Answer. The Roman Church taught long before, and much better
 then you, that no meates are vncleane vnto Christians, either of their
 owne natures, or for any signification as they were in the old Testament:
 and aboue one thousand and two hundred yeares past, condemned the
Eucharistes (*Tatianus* disciples) the *Manichees*, and *Priscillianists* for teach-
 ing flesh, wine, and many other meates, to be vncleane: but the same
 Church doth also command, that vpon some cetraind dayes, vvhē we
 are to humble our selues in prayer, and to assist our bodies by fasting;

that then wee must abstaine from the more delightfull and nourishing
 foode: as flesh, egges, and white meate; and be content with one meale
 of fish. This commandement of our Governours, doth not make the meate
 vncleane in it selfe: but vnlawfull for vs to eate of it, for that time only.

But, (saith M. PERKINS) It is against Christian liberty to be debarred of
 flesh at any time; by any Superiours; for God only hath reserved vnto himselfe that
 power, of forbidding to eate meates: so that without his expresse inhibi-
 tion, Christians cannot be deprived of any kinde of meate.

Behold an audacious assertion, without any ground. For albein we
 Christians be exempted from all vncleane meates of Moyses lawe; yet are
 we subject to the order of our Governours, for the manner of fasting; as
 hath bin proued before. Neither hath God so kept in his owne handes, the
 disposition of his creatures; but rather he hath permitted others, to make
 diuers sorts of meates vnlawfull for Christians to eate: as it is most mani-
 fest by the first Councell holden by the Apostles. For they had full pow-
 er to command and enioyne all Christians, to abstaine from all meates offered
 to Idols, from all strangled things, and from blood. How plainly then, doth
 it replegne vnto the expresse word of God, to avenge that God only can
 forbid Christians any kind of meate? Neither be these precisely the Apo-
 stles wordes: stand fast & hold this liberty, which he cited out of the Apostle,
 nor is there any mention made of fasting, but of circumcision; and gene-
 rally of the obseruation of Moyses lawe. The Apostle doth blame the Gala-
 thians for yeelding vnto the obseruation of it, & bidde them to flie from
 it; and stand in the liberty of other Christians; who were freed from the
 yoke of Moyses lawe; but not from obedience to their Christian Pastours.
 Howe absurd then was it to alledge that against Christian fasting, which
 doth nothing at all concerne it?

Nowe come the other place of the Apostle which M. PERKINS toucheth
 by the way, to wit: That certain departing from the faith, and attending
 vnto the spirit of error, shall teach to abstaine from meates, which God cre-
 ated to be receiued with thankes-giving. To this Saint Augustine hath an-
 swered directly to welle hundred yeares agoe; for hauing rehearsed
 those the Apostles wordes, he saith: He doth not describe and note them,
 who doe abstaine from such meates; either to bridle their owne concupiscence,
 or not to giue offence vnto the weakenes of others: but them that doe thinke the
 flesh in it selfe to be vncleane, and deny God to be Creator of such meates.
 Such vverre the Menichs (as Saint Augustine witnesseth) saying to Fau-
 stus a ring-leader among them: You deny the creature of God to be good, and
 say it is vncleane; because the Devil will make flesh of a more dreggy and base
 matter of euill, &c. So both Saint Hierome in his second booke against
 Iouinian.

AB. 15.
 vers. 29.

Galat. 5.

Cont. Adi-
 mantum.
 cap. 14.

Lib. 30.
 cap. 5.

Enition expound the same place of Saint Paul; and before them Tertul-
 lian in his Treatise of fasting, saying: that the Apostle there condemned be-
 fore hand, Martion and Tatianus. And the very reason, vvhich the Apo-
 stle giueth in the text, convinceth those vvordes to be only meane of such
 as should condemne the meate in it selfe to be vncleane. For it follow-
 eth in the text, *For every creature of God is good, &c.* vvherefore, touching
 this place I vvill conclude vvith these vvordes of Saint Augustin: *If Lent* L. 30. c. 67.
bee observed of your selves without flesh, and that not superstitiously, but ac- Fastum.
cording unto the lawe of God, see (I beseech you) whether it be not a point of cap. 3.
extreame madnesse, to thinke every abstinence from meate to bee called of S.
Paul, the doctrine of Devils.

But Socrates (a Christian hystoriographer) saith, *That the Apostles left* Li. 5. b. 18.
it free to every one, to vse what kinde of meates they would on fasting dayes. cap. 21.

What if Socrates say so that was an Heretike, and nothing so well studied
 in antiquity, as was S. Hierome, who had read all Authours; Latin, Greeke,
 and Hebrewe, that vvere to be had in his time? He affirmeth expressly, that
 it was a Tradition of the Apostles to fast Lent, and teacheth abstinence
 from flesh to be an essentiall part of fasting: as also S. Augustine in the place
 last cited, holdeth it to be a diuine lawe, to fast from flesh in the Lent. And
 diuers and many other ancient Fathers, the least of whome is of twenty
 times more credit then the *Naxian* Heretike Socrates: vvho also in the
 very same place (if his booke be not corrupted) sheweth himselfe very
 ignorant in the fast of the Romans. For hether he saith, *That they fasted but* Lib. 5.
three weekes before Easter; and in those three weekes also, excepted the Satur- cap. 21.
dayes: both which are very false. For Lep the great, who liued at the same
 time, and was Bishop of Rome, and therefore knewe the fastes of Rome bet-
 ter then he, teacheth very formally; *That they fasted then six whole weekes* Sermon. 3.
before Easter. Furthermore, that they fasted all the yeare long at Rome on
 Saturdayes. S. Augustine is a most sufficient vvitnesse, so farre were they
 at Rome, from excepting to fast on Saturday in Lent, as Socrates fableth.
 Xca. Gregory the great vvho liued not long after Socrates, doth testifie; Li. 3. Dia-
 log. c. 33.
that at Rome all euen vnto little children, doe fast vpon Saturday, Easter-

supper. *And most manifestly is shewed, that the vvord of God* Hist. Trip.
But Spindion a very holy man in Lent dressed himselfe in flesh, and set it be- li. 1. c. 10.
fore a stranger, eating himselfe, and bidding the stranger also to eat: who
refusing and professing himselfe to be a Christian; therefore (saith he) the
rather must doe it: for to the pure all thinges are pure, as the word of God
saith. In time of licknesse or extreame necessity it is lawful (with the
 consent and licence specially of our Pastour) to eat flesh, either in Lent.

De obser.
jejunij.
cap. Con-
siliū.

or vpon any other fasting day: as all men skillfull in cases of conscience, doe teach, being thereto warranted by the Canon lawe. This vvvas the case of that stranger with *Spiridon*, vvho had not so much as one morsell of bread in his house, or any other thing, sauing some swaines-flesh, powdered vp; as the text doth plainly testifie: and therefore he seeing the poore traailer very vweary after his journey, commanded some of that salted porke to be dressed to refresh him. Besides, *Spiridon* asked first pardon of God, before he set it before the stranger; and the stranger refused at the first to eate of it, because it was against the custome of Christians: both which circumstances doe evidently conuince, that no flesh was to be eaten in that time of Lent; had not very necessity with the want of such a godly Bishop as *Spiridon* was, made it lawefull: so that this story, so often alleadged by the Protestants against abstinence from flesh on fasting dayes; doth much rather confirme such abstinence, then make any thing against it, all circumstances of it duly considered.

Before I come vnto the third point of difference, I will briefly runne over three objections, which *M. PER.* here maketh for vs. The first: *Ionadab* commanded the *Rechabites* to abstaine from wine which they obeyed, and are much commended for it by God: much more (ibarefore) ought we to obey our Superiours commanding abstinence from some kinde of meates. He answereth, that this commandement was not given by *Ionadab* in way of religion, but for politike regards.

Reply. This he saith only but proueth it not. But suppose it were so, it would not serue his turne: for if he were obeyed for a ciuill respect, much rather ought he to haue bene obeyed for an ecclesiasticall and religious.

The second objection. *Daniell*, three weekes together abstained from flesh, and his example is our warrant. *M. PER.* answereth: that *Daniell* abstained freely, but the Popish abstinence from flesh standeth by commandement.

Reply. *Daniell* fast was of his owne deuotion, and consequently his abstinence from flesh, free: but our ordinary fasts are by commandement, and therefore by obedience we are bound to abstaine from flesh. Nowe, we vie the example of *Daniell*, not to proue that we are bound to fast; but that on fasting dayes we should forgoe the eating of flesh, as he did.

But *M. PER.* addeth: If we imitate *Daniell* in refraining from flesh, why doe we not imitate him also in abstaining from dainties and symmentals?

Answers. They doe better that imitate him in one good point, though they doe not in all, then they that followe him in none at all. Besides, all vniuersall dainties are forbidden, not only on fasting dayes; but at all times, both

both by the light of nature, and by our learned Pastors: but because that may be dainty to one, which is but ordinary and meete for another (their complexion and education considered) a certaine order could not be set for all sortes of people; touching dainty meates: wherefore, they are left vnto the rule of reason for that point, and to the instruction of their Pastours. Nowe we confesse with Molanus, that in ancient times, men were much more feruent in fasting then they be nowe a dayes, because the charity of many is growne colde: but yet (God be thanked) there be many religious persons and also others among vs, that doe an hundred times more devoutly fast, then the *Povertants* yse to doe; who making the liberty of Christians, the occasion of fleshly licentiousnesse, haue among their followers (wholly in manner) ruinated and rooted out all austeritie of life, and Ecclesiasticall discipline.

Thirdly (saith M. P. R.) they alleadge the diet of Iohn Baptist, whose meate was locustes and wilde bony: and of Timothy, who abstayned from wine. Answer: That abstinence which they vsed was only for temperance sake, and not for conscience or merit; let them proue the contrary if they can.

Math. 3.
1. Tim. 5.
vers. 23.

Reply. Valiantly spoken: but vwhy did he not proue his assertion? what was it, because he could not? the contrary is very easie to be proued. For if that diet of *S. Iohn Baptist* was only for temperance, then (belike) if he had eaten meate as other men did, he had bene in temperate, and finned in gluttony: which if it be absurd to thinke, more absurd is it to say, that his continuall abstinence, was only for temperance sake.

Nowe to the third and last part of our difference. *Catholikes* make abstinence it selfe, in persons fitly prepared, to be a part of the worshipping of God: but we take it to be a thing indifferent in it selfe: but yet well vsed, so be a proppie or furtherance to the worshipping of God.

It grieueth me to see the doubling and deceite, that this Minister many times vseth. Doe *Catholikes* make fasting of it selfe, vwithout his right end and all due circumstances, a part of Gods vvorshippe? if he say so (as his vvordes leade a man to beleue) he belyeth vs shamefully. For vve hold that no worke, be it neuer so good in it selfe; yet, if it want either a good end, or any other due circumstance, it is not good or pleasing to God. The point then in difference is this, that vve esteeme fasting duly performed, to be a part of Gods worshipping, and to appease his vvrathe towards vs; to satisfie for the temporall punishment of our finnes; and finally to be meritorious: which I will in a word confirme here, referring him that desireth to see more, vnto the severall Questions before handled, of Satisfaction, and Merits.

First, that God is thereby worshipped, it is set downe plainly in holy

Luc. 2. 30

Rem. 12.
vers. 1.

Scripture: *Amke by fasting and prayers, serued (or worshipped) God; as the Greeke word Latrousa signifieth. Again, exhibite your bodies (by fasting as the best Expositors declare) a living Host (or Sacrifice) holy, and pleasing God. And the reason is manifest: for vvhhen vve for his sake, doe afflict our bodyes, bothe to master the euill passions of it, and that our minde may more freely and seruently meditate vpon God; it cannot but be a gratefull seruice vnto him.*

Ioue 2.
vers. 10.

Secondly, that vve by fasting and humbling of our selues before God, and punishing our bodyes there-by, for our former fautes doe appease, and pacifie the vvvraoth of God; may be proued by many examples of the old Testament; but these two may serue the turne, which M. PERKINS witnesseth. The first of the Ninuities, vpon whom God took mercy at the contemplation of their fasting, and other workes of penance: so saith the text; *And God sawe their workes, &c. And had mercy vpon them: and therefore, vve condemne M. PERKINS extrauagant glosse of Orleans (as they say) which corrupteth so much the text; Thus the Ninuities (forsooth) laide hold on Gods mercy in Christ by faith: For that the Ninuities (being Gentils) had euer heard of Christ, or knewe the mystery of his mediation, Master PERKINS will neuer be able to proue.*

3. Reg. 21.
vers. 29.

The second example is of King Achab, vvhoe being threatned vvith great punishment according to his desert, fearing the iust iudgements of God, did fast and doe great penance: Wherevpon, God deliuid his punishment. And M. PERKINS doth greatly ouer-shoore himselfe, in affirming that this his repentance was but hypocrisie; vvhhen God himselfe doth say to Elias: *Hast thou not scene Achab humbled before me? Therefore, because he hath humbled himselfe for my sake, I will not bring euill vpon his house in his dayes, but in the dayes of his Sonne.* God saith that Achab was humbled for Gods owne sake: and M. PERKINS blasphemeth nor to correct him, and giue him (as it vv ere) the lie, saying, that it was but in hypocrisie: no meruaile if this man be bold vvith God his Church, that feareth not to controule God himselfe: S. Cyprian testifieth plainly, that by fasting we asswage and mitigate Gods angre, saying: *Let vs appease his wrath (as he himselfe admonisheth vs) by fasting, weeping, and lamenting.*

Serm. de
Lap.
locl. 2.

Lib. de je-
iunio.

The third fruit of fasting is, to satisfie for the temporall punishment due vnto our sinnes, after the remission of the eternall: vvhich very reason perswadeth, that they who haue offended God, by eating vnlawfull pleasures of the flesh, should by suffering some bodily chastisement, recompence for their former fautes. For as saith Tertullian: *Enen as first we vs of meats, did vnder vs: so fasting may satisfie God: vvhich might be*

confir-

confirmed by the example of King David, and many others. But M. Pericrieth out and saith: It is blasphemy to hold, that any other meanes should be applied to satisfie for sinne, besides Christes passion. To this I haue answered at large in the quotion of satisfaction: here I say in a word, that all mortall sinne, and the eternall punishment due vnto sinners therefore, is freely through Christ remitted to euery repentant sinner: but there remaineth after that remission, other temporall paine to be endured by the patty with selfe, as wel to make him conformable to Christ his head, as in punishment of his vngatefull fall, after he was once freely and fully pardoned.

Fourthly, fasting is very meritorious in Gods sight, as Christ saith expressly, when commanding vs to fast (not vpon vaine glory as the Pharisei did, but to please his heavenly Father) he addeth the reward: And thy Father who seeth thee in secret will repay thee.

Math. 6.
vers. 18.

And to Daniel the Angell saith: Because from the first day that thou gavest thy hart to vnderstand, thou diddest afflict thee in my sight (which was by fasting) thy wordes were heard, and I came for thy speaches sake.

Dan. 10.
vers. 12.

S. Paul (that chosen vessell of election) doth chastise his body (which was specially by fasting, as S. Chrysostome and the other Interpreters doe take it) & brought it vnder into bondage, least whiles he preached to others, he himselfe might become a reprobate.

1. Cor. 9.
vers. 27.

If one would stand to collect the Sermons of the Holy Fathers, made in the praise of fasting, he might fill a whole volume: take for a taste these few words out of S. Basil. Moyses durst not haue ascended into the mountayne, vnlesse he had bene fenced with fasting: by fasting he received the Commandements, written in a table by the finger of God.

Homil. 1.
de ieiunio.

A little after: Fasting leadeth vs to God, fasting to destruction. Samuel was by fasting and prayer obtayned of God. What made the most valiant Sampson invincible? was it not fasting? through which he was conceived in his mothers wombe: fasting conceived him, fasting nourished him, and fasting made him strong. Fasting breedeth Prophets: it strengthneth the mighty, it maketh lawe-makers prudent and wise: besides it chaseth away temptations, and armet a man to Godlinesse: it sanctifieth the Nazarite, purifieth the Priest. Neither is it lawfull to touch the Sacrifice without fasting, not only in this our mysticall and true adoration of God, but in such also which was a figure of it. Fasting made Elias a beholder of a great vision: for after he had by fourey daies fast purged his soule, he sawe God, as farre-forib as it is lawfull for a man. And much more to the same purpose.

The Puritan fast here commended by Master PERKINS is described and proscribed by the Prophet Esay 58. vers. 3. and 4. Behold, in the day of your fast, there is found your owne will: behold, you fast to strife and contention, &c. For their fast is not prescribed by publike authority of the state.

OF FASTING.

state, but out of their owne priuate Preachers fancy; and their exercises therefor the greater part, are inuectiues and raylinges against the Pope and Papists; and (perhaps) against the state also: to vvhom that worthy saying of *S. Augustine* may be applyed. *Doest thou duly take thy owne members or body, who searest the members of Christ?* And whereas in such time of common calamity, deuout men vvere vront in sacke-cloth to humble themselues before God: they meete (I warrant you) clothed in their best, and that trimmed vp curiously; so that they fast to stiffe, and so fulfill their owne fancy.

Finally (it seemeth) they fast certaine houres the longer, that they may afterward with better appetite, feede vpon a large and dainty banquet, which is alwayes highly provided, at the end of their holy exercises of speaking. Such fasters *S. Augustine* noteth with a blacke-cole; when he saith: *Fasting is not recommended in him; who is serueth his belly for a full supper;* as they, who vvhenthey have fasted till thre a clocke after noone, doe then or shortly after, fall with better appetite, to a full meale of the best meate that they can provide.

Thus much of fasting.

Nowe to the state of perfection.

OF THE STATE OF

PERFECTION.

M. PARKINS Page 332.

BECAUSE M. PARKINS here doth not deale vprightly, but vnder the title of our consents, putteth downe their owne doctrine, farre dissenting from ours; I will first ouer him, deliuer their opinion touching the perfection of man; and then declare ours; that vve may with more perspicuity perceiue the difference.

He in his first conclusion graunteth, *That all true beleeuers haue a state of true perfection in this life.* Which perfection (saith he) consisteth in two partes: The former is, the imputation of Christes perfect obedience vnto vs; The latter is, a certayne sincerity and vprightnesse, standing in two thinges: The first, is to acknowledge our owne imperfection; The second, to haue a constant purpose, endeauour, and care to keepe not some fewe; but all and euery Commandement of the Lawe of God. And this endeauour is a fruit of perfection; whiche is proceeded from the regenerate: For, as all men through Adams fall, haue in them by nature the seedes

of all sinne, the sinne against the holy Ghost not excepted: so by grace of regeneration through Christ, all the faithfull haue in them likewise, the seedes of all vertues necessary to saluation: and thereupon, they both can and doe endeavour to yeeld perfect obedience vnto God, according vnto the whole lawe; and so they may be termed perfect, as a child is called a perfect man: whosough be want the perfection of age, stature, and reason, yet, he hath euery part and faculty both of body and soule, that is required to a perfect man.

Hitherto M. P. R. In whose discourse of perfection, I finde many imperfections. For to omitte the imputatiue part of mans perfection (which I haue disproued in the question of justification.) Howe can it well hang together, that one and the same point of mans perfection (to wit: an endeavour to keep all Gods commandements) is both an essentiall part of it; and yet but a fruit issuing out of it; as M. P. R. maketh it in expresse termes, and that within the compasse of fewe lines. For if this good endeavour, be but a fruit of perfection, proceeding from a man regenerate, as he saith in the later place: then surely the man regenerate vvas perfect before hee had that fruit; and so can it not be any substantiall part of perfection, as he before appointed it. Further, if he meaneth that the inward and inherēt perfection of the regenerate, doth wholly consist in the seedes of vertue, either he taketh the seedes very improperly for the corne, and perfect vertues themselves: or else, he leaueth his perfect man (as the Heathen Philosophers did a babe newly borne) like vnto a rased paire of tables, altogether imperfect; hauing nothing written in them, but an aptnesse only and capacity to receiue much, if it be by diligent endeavour afterward filled. But it is much to be wondered at, that he is become so exact a censor, as to require in his imperfect perfect man, *A constant purpose, endeavour, and care to keepe not some fewe, but all and euery Commandement of the lawe of God.* Hath he not often before; yea, doth he not in this very question take it for certaine, that no regenerate man can fulfill the lawe? which if it were true, howe can any haue a constant purpose to keepe it? For (as both Philosophers and diuines doe teach in schoole, and very reason informeth euery one of meane understanding at home) no man vvell in his wits, can haue a full purpose and determination to doe that, vvich he knoweth to be impossible for him to doe. Who euer endeauoured to leape ouer mountaines? or had a speciall care to build Churches, not knowing any possible meanes to effect them? M. PERKINS then was very euill aduised to counsaile his regenerate man, to haue a constant purpose to endeavour, and care to keepe that, which he teacheth to be impossible for him to fulfill and accomplish. Nowve to the doctrine of the Catholikes.

In his
reason.

We teach first, that a man baptised and in the state of grace, hath in

him not the seedes only of all vertues both morall and diuine, necessary for his sanctification, but the vertues themselves, infused and powred in his soule, by the bountifull hand of God, through the merits of Christ Iesus our redeemer, without any desert of ours: vvhereby man is made able vvith the assistance of Gods grace, to overcome his owne euill passions, and to fulfill all Gods Commandments. And this kinde of perfection vve hold, to be freely bestowed vpon euery Christian at his first justification, of vvhich I haue treated at large in that question. A second kinde of perfection there is, vvhich consisteth in the perfect and complete subduing of all such disordinate affections; such a complete mortification of them I doe vnderstand, as the frailty of our nature doth permitte in this life; vnto vvhich the best men (after long exercise of all kinde of vertue) doe attayne. Of neither of these two states of perfection doe vve here entreate: but the present controuersie is about a third kinde of perfection, vvhich is (as it vvere) placed betweene the other two, more perfect then the first, and not so perfect as the last: but it is a more speedy and ready vvay to the later, and consisteth in the obseruation of some such extraordinary vvorkes, that be not commanded of God, as necessary to saluation; but commended, as thinges of more excellency, and left vnto our free choise vvwhether vve vvill vndertake them or no: For example, God forbiddeth vs to commit adultery: but he doth not command vs to profess virginity, and to liue alwayes a single life; the vvhich yet he recommendeth, and exhorteth vs to embrace,

Math. 19. saying: *There be some that make themselves Eunuchs for the Kingdom of*
vers. 12. *heauen;* adding, *He that can take it, let him take it:* so he forbiddeth to
Ibidem. steale; but counsaileth only to sell all we haue, and to giue it to the poore
vers. 21. and to followe him. Out of which and th alike places of holy Scriptures

we gather; that there be diuers blessed good vvorkes, vvhich are not commanded by any precept; yet, counsailed and perswaded as thinges of greater perfection, which are also called vvorkes of supererogation, by a name taken from these vvordes: *Quisquid supererogaueris*, vvhere the good Samaritane told the Inne-keeper, that whatsoeuer he should lay out, ouer and besides that vvhich he had giuen him, should be repayed him at his retourne. These vvorkes of perfection and supererogation, the Protestants may nor abide, in shewe (forsooth) of profound humility, because all that we can doe, is nothing in respect of that which we ought to doe: but (in deede) vpon enuy and malice towards religious men and women; the lustre and fame of whose singuler vertue, doth mightily obscure and disgrace their fleshly and base conuersation, vvho commonly passe not the vulgar sort in any other thing, but in tongue and habie.

OF THE STATE OF PERFECTION.

M. PERKINS in his second conclusion, alloweth only vnto our Saviour Christ, workes of supererogation, because he alone fulfilled the lawe: wherefore (saith he) his death was more then the lawe could require at his handes being innocent.

But if I listed to take aduantages as he offereth them, I could tell him, that although the lawe could exact nothing at Christs handes, hee being God and aboue the lawe; yet, al that euer Christ did was commanded him by his Father: and therefore by a certaine vncertaine rule of M. PER. (to wit, That no worke commanded: can be a worke of supererogation) he could not doe any worke of supererogation, being bounde to doe all he did, by commandement of his heauenly Father, whome he was bounde to obey.

But to come to the point of our difference: we hold that there be many workes of perfection, vnto which no man is bound; neuer thelesse whoeuer shall performe any of them, they shall haue a greater crowne of glory in heauen for their reward. M. PER. goeth about to disproue it, by prouing that no man can fulfill the lawe of God in this life. much lesse doe workes of supererogation. I say that he taketh not a direct course to improve our position. For albeit a man could not fulfil the law, yet may he doe many of those workes of perfection: for a man may lead a chaste life; & yet sometime in a passion fall out with his neighbour, and hurt him in word or deede, or sweare, and so offend in choller: for this sometime hapneth; and then the workes of perfection not commanded, being done by such a one, may the sooner purchase him pardon, and be great helpe to him, towards the fulfilling of the lawe: wherefore, Master PERKINS erretth in the very foundation of his proofes; notwithstanding we will heare his arguments, because they serue to fortifie an other odde sconce or bulwarke of their heresie, to wit: That it is impossible to keepe Gods Commandments. The first; he propoundeth in this sort.

In the morall lawe two thinges are commanded: first, the loue of God and man; secondly, the manner of this loue. Nowe the manner of louing of God, is to loue him with all our hart and strength: Thou shalt loue the Lord thy God, with all thy hart, and with all thy soule, and with all thy strength, and with all thy thoughts, &c. As Bernard said: The measure of louing God, is to loue him without measure; and that is, to loue him with the greatest perfection of loue, that can befall a creature. Hence it followeth, that in louing God, no man can possibly doe more then the lawe requireth: and therefore, the performance of all vowes and of all other duties, come to short of the intention and scope of the lawe.

Answer. To loue God with all our hart, and strength, &c. may be vnderstood in two sorts. The first is to loue him so intirely, that we loue no other thing with him, in any such degree, as may not well stand with his loue:

and also that in Gods seruice (when his honour shal so require) we are ready to imploy our vvhole strength, hart, and life; and in this sence every good Christian doth loue God; with all his hart, and may doe (besides his bounden duty therein) many other good vvorkes: because the precept being affirmatiue, doth not binde for all times; but only nowe and then, when occasion so requireth. Secondly, the wordes may be taken to signifie, that we should alwayes (with all the powers of both body and minde, and that at the vttermost straine) loue, honour, and serue God: and so taken, it is fulfilled in heaven, but cannot be performed on earth by any mortall creature, with ordinary grace; because we must sleepe and eate sometimes, and doe many other things besides, though not contrary to the same loue. In the first sence we are commanded to loue God with all our hart, &c. And in the second, it is no commandement, but only a marke for vs to ayme and lenell at; but no man vnder sinne is bound to attayne vnto it.

To that of *S. Bernard* I answere, that to loue God as much as he is to be loued, is to loue him infinitely, which none can doe, but only God himselfe. If he meane that we must loue God without measure: then he is to be vnderstood, that in the loue of God, there be not (as in the matter of other vertues) two extremities; too little and too much: only there may be too little; but there cannot be too much; yet, there is a certaine measure or degree, to which every one is bound to attaine: whither, if he haue gotten, he loueth God with all his hart, as before hath beene declared. Now beyond that degree, the perfecter sort of Christians doe mount, and so much the more; by howe much they doe proceede in that perfection: yet, in this life they can neuer attaine to loue God, so seruently and so perfectly; but that they may alwaies encrease and loue him more and more; & so there is not a prefixed meere stone, or limit of louing God: in which sence only, we may truly say; that God is to be loued without measure: but that is (as I said before) rather a marke that vve should shoot at, and the end of a commandement, then a thing commanded.

M. PERKINS second reason. The compasse of the lawe is large and comprehendeth commandements, not only negative but also affirmative, and in the negative be not only forbidden the capitall sinnes, as murder, adultery, theft: but all sortes of the same kinde, with all their occasions, &c. And in the affirmative are commanded not only the contrary vertues, but all helpes and meanes, whereby the said vertues may be preserved: thus doth our Saniour himselfe (saith he) expound the lawe. Vpon which ground he concludeth, that all duties pertaining to life and manners, come within the list of some morall commandement.

Answer. The Commandements are but tenne, and the exposition which

which our Sauour made, contained vwith in the compasse of two Chapters, as he confesseth: wherefore, it is not a thing either impossible or very difficult, to learne and obserue them, with all their necessary branches and clauses. Nowe to say, *That all duties of life appertayne vnto them*, is both false, and not to the purpose: for first, it is most euident, that the vvhole matter of the Sacraments, and vvhatsoeuer else is proper vnto vs Christians by the doctrine of the Gospell, and not common vnto vs with the *Iewes*, is ouer and aboue the tenne Commandements: I said also, that the answer is impertinent: for it proceedeth only in duties of life, and we create here of such points of perfection, which no man in duty is pressed vnto; but only may followe of deuotion, for his aduancement in vertue and Gods fauour. The other reasons following I haue answered in my former part, yet because some will be vnwilling to be so often referred vnto another volume, I will here againe briefly answer them.

M. PERKINS third reason. *When we haue done all those things that are commanded us, we are vnprofitable seruants, we haue done that which was our duty to doe.* Lut. a 17.

Can any man tell to what purpose this sentence is cited here? Is it to proue that we cannot keepe the Commandements? but it supposeth the flat contrary, to vvit: that the vnprofitable seruant had done all those things, that were commanded him; for he must say as it is in the text, *When he hath done that which was commanded, &c.* Or it is to disproue workes of supererogation and counsaile; but it hath not one worde of them, but speaketh only of workes commanded, which *S. Ambrose* noted 1200. yeares past, saying: *This doth not the Virgin say, this doth not he say who sold Deuidus, all (to wit, we are vnprofitable seruants:) but looking for a reward, they say with S. Peter, Lord we haue left all, what therefore wilt thou giue vs? &c.* Math. 19.

But M. PERKINS will confute *S. Ambrose*: for he saith, *That things commanded in that they be commanded, are more excellent then things left at liberty.*

What is this to the matter? doth Christ speake of counsailes left to our liberty in that text, because commandements be more excellent? vvhata sencelesse reply is this? Of like stuffe is his other shifte, *That counsailes are thought more hard then commandements: and therefore, if a man cannot profit himselfe by obseruing the easer, much lesse by obseruing the harder.* First, this is cleane besides the purpose; then it is also false. For no men commonly can profit themselves so much by things easie to be done, as by some other things hard to be done: for the more excellent that things are, so much the more difficult are they to be compassed and done, according to the Latin Adage: *Quo difficilius eo pulchrius.*

M. PERKINS saith: Papists answer secondly, that although we be unprofitable to God: yet we are profitable to our selves.

Reply. This is reported to the halves: for we say, that to God in himselfe, no profit can arise from vs, who needeth none of our goodes or seruice; but in the Ministry of his Church, he hath great seruice and honour done him, by the industry and diligence of good men: and therefore doth *S. Paul* say expressly: *That men cleansed from sinnes, become profitable seruants vnto our Lord*, which is venerable *Bedes* exposition vpon this passage of *S. Luke*.

2. Tim. 2. vers. 21. But Master PERKINS saith, *That they are neither profitable to God, nor to themselves: because the Master there doth not so much as thank that seruant.*

Reply. Masters in deed doe not commonly thank their seruants, when they haue done their duties: but yet, they pay them their wages, and giue them presentments also, if they like their seruice; and so the seruant reapeth commodity and profit by his seruice; though he be not thanked at his Masters handes. But we serue so kinde a Master, that will before his Father and all the company of heaven, charge his seruants, and say vnto *Math. 25. vers. 23.* *them: Well saith thee, good and faithfull seruant, because thou hast bene faithfull ouer a fewe thinges, I will place thee ouer many. enter into the joy of thy Lord.* A third answer Papists may make vnto Master PERKINS, and tell him, that hee hath desperately corrupted the text, and omitted a vvorde, vvhich altereth the vvhole sentence. Christ saith not, *When you haue done all that is commanded, you are vnprofitable seruants*: but, *then say, that you are vnprofitable seruants*. That is: haue you then an humble opinion of your selves, and thinke rather vpon your owne imperfection, then of your vvell-doing; and if you finde all vvell, thanke him that gaue you the grace to performe it, and confesse that you haue done but your duty: and leaue it to your good neighbour, to praise you if he please, and to God to recompence you: so doth *S. Chrysostome* interpret this place. But Master PERKINS to preuent this answer, thought it policy to strike that vvorde out of the text. O vvorthy cutter of Gods vvorde!

His fourth reason is: *That it is not in the power of man to keepe the lawe: much lesse is he able to doe any worke that is beyond and aboue the lawe.*

Page 78. *Answer.* The antecedent and consequent are both false: that vve be able with the helpe of Gods grace, to keepe the lawe, is proued in a whole question of the first part. That we may doe some workes of supererogation (albeit we fayled in some workes of the lawe) hath bene proued in the beginning of this question. For though one vvorke of countenance faile

saile be harder to doe, then one worke of the lawe; yet, is it of more difficulty to keepe thirty precepts of the lawe, then three counsailes: and againe, a man may be more diligent in obseruing counsailes, then commandements, and so obserue them better.

Nowe to the arguments for the *Catholike* party. The first is taken out of the Prophet *Esay*: *Our Lord saith vnto Eunuches that keepe his Sabbaoth, Cap. 56. and choose the thing that pleaseth him, &c. He will giue them a place and a name, better then to the Sonnes and Daughters, an euerlasting name that shall not perish.* vers. 4.

Hence we thus reason. Vnto Eunuches that choose the thing which pleaseth God (that is, make choise of a single and chaste life) God will giue more grace in this world, and more glory in the next, as *Saint Augustine* also expoundeth it. Nowe, no man is bound by the lawe to professe virginity, as *Saint Paul* declareth: vvhwherefore, the obseruation of virginity is of counsaile and supererogation, very pleasing to God if it be performed: yet, not commanded. Master *PERKINS* answereth: *That to such Eunuches, a greater reward is promised, not for profession of their chastity, but because they obserued the Lordes Sabbaoth, and kept his commandments, which is (saith he) to beleene the worde of God, and to obey his Commandements.* cap. 25. 1. Cor. 7.

Replie. This cannot be said: for vnto those Eunuches, A greater reward is promised then vnto other Sonnes and Daughters, that is: then to others of the faithfull. Nowe that greater must be due vnto them for something in them, which was not to be found in other of the faithfull; But to beleene the word of God, and to obey his Commandements, is a thing common vnto all that are to be saved: therefore, it followeth necessarily, that for their chastity wherein they excelled others, they are preferred before others; which is confirmed by that place, where it is said: *That they that are Virgins (because they were Virgins) doe sing a song, that no man else can sing: See S. Augustine cap. 29. de Virg. and in the Chapter of vowes in the former part, where this argument is more largely proued.* Apoc. 14.

The second argument: our Sauour Christ saith, *That there are some who haue made them-selues chaste, for the Kingdome of Heauen; and bid- deth them that can take that course of life, to take it: therefore, the vowe of single life is varrantable by the worde of God, and hath a special promise of glory in heauen, and yet is not commanded: vvhence it evidently followeth, that there are vworkes of counsaile, ouer and besides the Commandements of God, left to the free choise of men.* Math. 19. vers. 12.
Master *PERKINS* answereth: *That some hauing the gift of continency, doe leade a single life, that they may with more liberty and lesse distraction,*

distraction; ^{and} over the good state of the Church of God, or the kingdome of grace in themselves, and others: this (saith he) is all that can be gathered out of this place.

Not all, but so much as out of which, therell necessarily followeth, to wit: that by profession of chastity, as they doe more benefite the Church of God; so consequently doe they more please God; and deserue of him a greater reward: and that chastity being only counsailed and not enjoyned by precept, it is a worke of supererogation and perfection.

Matth. 19. The third argument: Christ saith vnto a young man: If thou wilt be perfect, goe sell that thou hast, and giue to the poore, and thou shalt haue a treasure in heauen: and come and follow me. Hereupon we inferre, that he who forsaketh all to follow Christ, shall haue a treasure (that is) a greater measure of glory in heauen; and yet, that this is not commanded any man, but commended to them, as being a worke of greater perfection: If thou wilt be perfect, See, goe sell all, &c. M. P. R. answereth, that Christ to discouer to this man the secret corruption of his owne heart, commanded him to goe sell all: and so this is a commandement of tryall, not common to all, but speciall to him only, as the sacrificing of Abrahams sonne was only to Abraham, and was to be done for an example to others.

Reply. First, Christes wordes doe shew manifestly, that this was no absolute commandement; not so much as to that young man, *To sell all:* but conditionall, if he aspired vnto greater perfection, then the keeping of the commandements. For he was first bid to *keepe the commandments,* if he would haue life euermlasting; and he answering that he had so done from his

Marc. 10. youth, and desirous to knowe what was yet wanting vnto him: then Iesus looking on him, loved him, as it is expressely set downe in the text; so farre off was he from mistaking or taxing of him: and after said, Thus if he would be perfect, he should goe and sell all; so that M. P. R. idle paraphrase, is flat against the text. Again, as Christes speech in the beginning to that young man (If thou wilt haue life, keepe the commandments:) is to be extended vnto all others, who if they keepe Gods Commandements, shall be saued as well as that young man: so these his later must be common vnto all, that tend to perfection. Moreover, this exposition is confirmed by the question of S. Peter following in the same Chapter; Lord (behold) we haue forsaken all (we haue done that which thou didst counsaile vnto that young man) what reward shall we therefore haue: which argueth, that Christ did not only exhort that young man to forsake all; but that whosoever should so doe, to followe Christ, should be highly rewarded for it: and that (as Christ himselfe there promisseth) He shall therefore receiue an hundred fold, and life euermlasting. Finally, the practise of the best Christians recorded in the Acts;

Cap. 4. vers. 37. Who sold all, and laid the price of it, at the Apostles feet; and the Commentaries

of the Doctors, doe most manifestly confute this miserable shift of the Protestants: for they all teach it both to be a counsaile, and char also general vnto whosoever pleaseth to take it.

The fourth reason. At concerning Virgins I haue no commandement of our Lord, but counsaile I giue. as hauing obtained mercy of our Lord to be faithfull, This counsaile he expresse: I would all men as be as my selfe, (that is) to liue unmarried, saying also, That he whomerrieth doeth well, but he whomerrieth not doeth better: whence it followeth most plainly, both that chastity & single life is counsailed, not commanded; & that it is better so to liue, then to marry. M. P. answereth with the old Heretike Louinian, That it is better in some temporall respect, because single men are freed from many worldly cares, which married men be clogged withall. But that most worthy Doctor S. Augustine hath rejected this answer many hundred yeares past, saying: They doe maruailously dare, who thinke the goodnes of this chastity, not to be necessary for the kingdom of heauen, but for this present world: which he confirmeth by the Prophet *Esaie* 58. by our Saviour *Matthe* 23. and *Apocalips* 14. which are cited before; and his wordes I haue alleadged at length in the question of vower: wherefore I omitte them here. But we neede no other then S. Paul himselfe in the same Chapter, to teach that single life is better; as for the auoiding of worldly busines, so for pleasing of God: who making an antithesis betweene the Virgin and the married woman, saith: *The Virgin is careful for the things that appertaine vnto our Lord, how she may please God, and be holy in body and spirit: whereas the wife is careful of this world, and becometh please her husband; so that for sanctification of body and soule, and for pleasing God, virginity (by the expresse sentence of the Apostle) is better then marriage; and therefore, they must needs be much blinded with partiality, that cannot see it, or obstinately bent against the truth, that seeing it, will not confesse it.*

The fifth argument. It is good for me to dye rather, then that any man should make my glory void. For if I Euangelize, it is no glory to me: for necessity lieth vpon me. See! What is my reward then? that preaching the Gospell, I yield the Gospell without cost. Out of which wordes we collect, that S. Paul preaching the Gospell on his owne charges, without any cost vnto his Auditors, did a worke of supererogation; and that therefore he expected both glory, and reward at Gods handes. M. P. answereth: That generally it was in Pauls liberty to preach the Gospell freely, or not to doe it: but in Corinth vpon speciall circumstances, he was bound in conscience to preach it freely, as he did; the reason of false teachers, who would otherwise haue taken occasion to disgrace his ministry; and haue bindred the glory of God: Now it was Pauls duty to prevent that bindrance.

1. Cor. 7.

vers. 25.

Vers. 38.

Vers. 32.

33-34

1. Cor. 9.

vers. 16.

2. Cor. 11.

vers. 12.

1. Cor. 9.

vers. 12.

Reply. *S. Paul* himselfe hath confuted for vs, both partes of this answer. The former (*That he was bound to preach freely in that place*) in these wordes: *If I preach, it is no glory to me; so that if he were bound in conscience to preach freely, he could expect no such glory, as he speaketh off; and yet he saith, That he would rather die, then lose that glory and reward: whence it appeareth plainly, that he was not bound in conscience to preach there of free cost; which he also most largely proueth from the third verse of that Chapter vnto the three and twenty: By Moyses law, by Christes Commandement, by the example of all the other Apostles, and by many comparisons, and reasons; so that nothing is more cleare, then that he might haue liued at Corinth, as well as in other places, on their charges to vvhome he preached.* And by his whole discourse, a man may easily gather, that the false teachers did (cleane contrary to *M. Parkins* imagination) accuse him for not taking his charges, as the rest did: vvhervpon they maliciously gaue out, that he was no Apostle, nor had not the freedome to liue by the Gospel, as the Apostles had; to vvhich in the beginning of the Chapter he answereth. *Am I not free? am I not an Apostle? and my desire to them that examine me is this: haue not the power to eate and drinke, as also the rest of the Apostles? &c.* Where he proueth that he had power so to doe; yet would not vse that power, but preach freely: both for his owne greater glory and reward in heaven: and also, that no kinde of let might be giuen vnto the contentious persons and niggardes, who not being liberall in expences, he chose rather to liue among them at his owne cost, then to burden them, vvhom might (perhaps) not be so willing to receive him, if they must haue beene at charges to maintayne him: or else, to auoide the sinister report of some malicious, who would not haue spared to haue brayed abroad; that he made gaines of the Gospel, although he had sparingly liued by it. Briefly, to auoide some such let, as he was not in conscience bound to auoide, because it was not any standall of the weake, which we are bound to auoide, but of the wicked and malicious, which may with good conscience be condemned, as the other Apostles did: (yet *S. Paul* of a superabundant charity, had an eye to this also:) so that the other Apostles that did liue vpon the Gospel, did very well: but he better, that would not vse that his power and liberty.

Our sixth argument is taken from the restlessness of the ancient Church, *In cap. 15. Origen* saith: *Those things which we doe above duty, we doe them not by commandment. For example, virginity is performed not of duty: for it is not required by any commandment, but is offered above duty.*

De habit. S. Cyprian, speaking of virginity, saith: *Neither doth our Lord command virginity, this, but commend it; and exhort vnto it: and where as in his Fathers house there*

there be many mansions, you Virgins tend unto the better places, and by cutting off the desires of the flesh: you shall obtayne in heauen a reward of greater grace. The like saith S. Basil de Virginitat. S. Chrysostome Homil. 8. de penitent. S. Hierome lib. 1. cont. Iouu. S. Augustine de sanct. Virg. cap. 30. with many others, which to auoide perplexity I doe omitte.

OF THE WORSHIPPING OF SAINTS,

SPECIALLY OF INVOCATION.

OVR CONSENTS.

M. PERKINS Page 245.

THe first conclusion: The true Saints of God are to be worshipped three wayes. First, by keeping in remembrance their vertues. Secondly, by giuing thanks to God for them, and the benefits that by them God vouchsafed to his Church. Thirdly, They are to be honoured by imitation of their vertues.

The second conclusion. Their true reliques (that is) their vertues and good examples left to all posterity. we keepe and respect with due reverence: yea, if any man can shew vs the bodily true reliques of any true Saint, and can proue it so to be, though we will not worshipping it, yet will we not despise it, but keepe it as a monument, if it may be done without offence. And thus farre we agree with the Church of Rome.

ANNOTATION.

HOwe vvell the Protestants obserue and keepe the vertues and good examples of the Saints, I leave it to the vertuous readers consideration. But what deuotion they haue to their holy reliques, may appeare partly by the manifold limitations this man vseth: If they be true reliques, if of true Saints, if we can so proue them (for they are resolute to call all into doubt:) and finally, If it may also be done without offence (so wile of their nyake Bretheren, and fellowe Heretikes (vvhich can neuer be) then (loe) this considerate and aduised man, will not despise them. By these exceptions, one may easily espie the coldnes of their affection towards them. But the practise of their predecessours (vvhich made haucke, and burnt all the honourable reliques of the best Saints, that they could

lay their hands vpon, without reuerence and respect, doth demonstrate the same wicked spirit to haue possessed them, which of old spured forward the *Iews* and *Pagans*, to consume into ashes the blessed bodies of the *Martirs*, least the Christians should worshipping them and keepe them most reuerently, as they were alwayes accustomed to doe, when they could get them. Yea, if they could but rake out of the ashes, the least peeces of their burnt bones, they did esteeme them *more pure then gold*, and of greater value, then *precious stones*, as in expresse termes is recorded in the Ecclesiasticall History of *Eusebius*: see what respect men in the purest antiquity, carryed towards the bodily reliques of Saints.

Lib. 4.
cap. 14.

THE DIFFERENCE.

Our dissent lyeth in the manner of worshipping: the Papists make two degrees of religious worshipping, &c.

Because the Protestants doe seeme not to vnderstand the *Catholike* doctrine, concerning the worshipping of Saints, but out of their affected ignorance, doe esteeme vs therefore *Idolaters*: I hold it expedient to explicate the state of this question more particularly.

To beginne then with this word *worshippe*: it doth signifie a knowledge or conceite of another mans excellency, joyned with a reuerent respect to the same person, vwith some either inward or outward acknowledgement thereof: so that all worshippe is due and done vnto an other, in regard of some excellent quality, which we suppose to be in him.

Nowe there being three most generall kindes of excellency, there must also be three seuerall and distinct sortes of worshippe, correspondent vnto them.

The first and principall kinde of excellency, is infinit, and proper to God alone, who is almighty, infinitely wise and good, the only Creatour, supreme Governour, and final end of heauen and earth, and of all things containd in them: therefore, to him alone appertayneth infinit honour and glory, and that supreme worshippe, which the *Latins* (vsing the *Greek* word) call *Latria* Godly honour. Nowe to attribute or give this supreme worshippe vnto any other, then vnto God only, is *Idolatri*, the most haynous offence that can be.

The second sort of excellency, I make the meanest of all absolute (for of respectiue excellency which is in Images, and such like holy things, I haue spoken in that Chapter) and that is to be found only in creatures, indued with reason and vnderstanding, in regard of some rare quality and endowment, wherein they excell and surpasse others; so that that excellent vertue and quality, doe proceede only out of the naturall faculty and

per-

perfection of the party; and doe not spring from any supernaturall gifts therefore; within the compasse of this sort of excellency; I comprehend all naturall perfections, either of Men or Angels; because all such issue out of one generall fountayne, of a nature inclined with reason: and to this kinde of excellency is due, a morall or ciuill obeyfance or worshippinge.

There is a third kinde of excellency seated betwene the two former extreames, farre surpassing the naturall perfection of any pure creature; and yet infinitely lesse then the diuine Majesty of God, which consisteth in the perfection of Faith, Hope, Charity, Religion, and other such like gifts of the holy Ghost. And to this kinde of excellency, is due a different manner of worshippinge, which the *Latins* for distinction sake doe call *Dulia*. Note that I say for distinction sake: for both the wordes *Latria* and *Dulia* if they be taken in their first naturall signification, may be giuen vnto any kinde of worship due to God or Man: yet, to auoide confusion; the learned Diuines haue appropriated *Latria* vnto the worshippinge of God; and *Dulia*, to signifye the honour due to Saints or Angels; in regard of their supernaturall perfections.

To come nowe vnto the first point of our difference. The *Patriarchs* doe commonly confound these two later kindes of worshippinge, and doe make but one of both the ciuill and supernaturall; that they may sleippe from the one of them to the other, when they be driuen vnto their shifts: and yet nothing is more cleare, then that they be distinct and different the one from the other; as the grace of God is, from the nature of a reasonable creature. For as morall and ciuill worshippinge only, is due vnto that excellency which ariseth out of the naturall power of man; not assisted with any extraordinary grace of God: (such as was in the old *Hebrews* in *Samson*, who for their valiant prowesse, and pollike government deserved to be honoured & worshipped:;) even so the fortitude of *Christian Martirs*, the wisdom of Ecclesiasticall Prelates, the power of diuers Confessors in curing all sortes of diseases, and in working myracles. These (I say) and the like diuine prerogatiues, cannot but deserue a farre more excellent kinde of honour and worshippinge, then the former; as they are more spirituall and heavenly qualities; springing from a more excellent roote of the grace of God: which surpasseth in degree of excellency, the nature of Angels without comparision, who are but Gods seruants by nature, though of greater perfection then we. By grace they were made adopted sonnes of God, and partakers of the diuine nature, as *S. Peter* teacheth it; so as the Saints also were, who therein were equall to Angels: Wherefore *Naaman the Syrian*, had reason to worshippinge very humbly the Prophet *Elisay*; who (if we consider only ciuill excellency) was but a meane person in respect

10. 10. 1
matth. 17
10. 10. 1

2. Pet. 1.
vers. 4

offspring, that was a principal commander ouer all the martiall affaires of a pious King: notwithstanding, he truly weighing another more excellent kinde of power and wisdom in *Heliseus*, then was in himselfe; and another kinde of credit which he had, which the God of heauen, of farre greater estimation, then that he had with his kinge, did very dutifully humble himselfe before the Prophet. All which conuinceth, that there is in godly and holy personages, another kinde of excellency aboue naturall reach, to which is due a supernaturall reuerence and worshippinge, distinct from Ciuill: the which spirituall and supernaturall worship we commonly call *religious*; because it is giuen vnto holy men or Saints, in consideration of their religious vertues, of faith, charity, fortitude in defence of religion, and of Ecclesiasticall superiority. The name of *religious* worshippinge the Protestants vnderstand mislike, pretending that all kinde of religious worship is due vnto God only: but better men and greater clearkes then they by many degrees, doe vnderstand in the very same sence, as may be seene in diuers of *S. Augustine*'s works, Let this one sentence suffice, where he saith: That Christian people doe celebrate the memories of *Adams*, with religious solemnity. True it is, that religious worship is sometimes (by the said holy father and others) taken more strictly, for the principall acts of religion, which are proper vnto God alone; and in that sence we deny it to be giuen vnto any creatures: but the same word is also (not seldom) used by them in a more large signification, and applied vnto all thinges that belong to religion: so we call *religious* men, such as are specially chosen to serue God: *religious* houses, places where God is serued: *religious* vertues, such as issue out of the roote of religion; and consequently *religious* honour or worship, that is exhibited vnto men for their excellency, in religious qualities, and religious offices: so that any indifferent man (who delighteth not to censure in others) vnderstanding our meaning to be very farre off from attributing any sort of Gods honour, vnto any Saint or any other thing whatsoeuer, can not be iustly offended with our termes of *religious* worshippinge giuen to Saints; when as he is before hand giuen to vnderstand, that we take *religious* to signifie, not that which is proper to God: but those religious gifts which be in godly men.

Hence also it followeth most perspicuously what intolerable wrong they doe vs, that call vs *idolaters*, or say, that we robbe God of his honour, and giue it vnto Saints. For wee say, and repeat it a thousand times ouer and ouer, and declare it as plainly as can be, that it is the most heinous crime in the world, to giue any such soueraigne honour, as is due to God only, vnto anyther Angels or Saintes, to vnde: to esteeme them to be infinitely mighty, wise, or good; or to bee the Creatours or

supream

L. 20. c. 1.
Faustum
c. 21.

OF THE WORSHIPPING OF SAINTS, OR THE

supreme Governours of heaven and earth; or briefly, to be the authors of any supernaturall or naturall excellency or perfection. These and such like pointes of Divine honour, we ascribe not to any creature: but say, that the Saintes are Gods creatures and servants; and doe receive all that they either be or haue, of Gods liberality; yet we hold it not to derogate any whit from the due honour we owe unto God, to yield such honour and worship unto his Saintes and servants; as he hath made them worthy of. Nay rather, we doe not a little honour God himselfe, when we worship Godly men; for his diuine gifts bestowed vpon them, and when wee thinke, that (because they haue faithfully serued him on earth) they are now in heauen in high fauour with him; and can soone obtaine any reasonable suite of him, then other mortall men, who are subject to many infirmities. Neyther doe wee diminish any thing at all Christ our Saviours mediation, by making the Saintes our intercessours. For (as shall bee hereafter declared at large) we attribute no point of Christs mediation to them; but only range and place the Saintes intercession, with the prayers of other good men liuing on earth, and with our owne; although in a different degree of perfection; theirs being farre better then ours: yet all are made in Christs name; and are effectuell through the merits of his Passion.

But one may here object, howe then doe *Catholikes* affirme and say, that the Saintes are their hope, and refuge, and howe can they desire them, To haue mercy vpon them, and to helpe them; which seeme to be thinges proper to God alone; and to Christ our redeemer? I answer first, that these speeches in good fence haue beene vsed by most auncient learned, and circumspect Authours, and that by imitation of the holie Scriptures. For holy Iob saith: *Haue mercy on me, haue mercy on me, at least Iob 19: You my friends.* And Saint Paul calleth the *Thessalonians*, *His hope, his 1: Thess. 2: joy, and crowne of glory*; and desireth the *Romans* to helpe him in their prayers: and saith to the *Corinthians* that he becometh all things to all men; that he might saue all; which diuers such like. So that no discrete man ought to condemne such speeches to the Saintes, if they bee vnderstood with a good meaning; to witte: that they taking compassion of our frailty and misery; doe by their gracious intercession helpe to procure our pardon, and to obtayne at Gods bounteous handes, through the merit of Christs passion, all such heavenly graces as we stand neede of. Albeit (as I haue sayed) such tearmes haue beene very well vsed in all antiquity; yet in these our captious dayes I could wish, that *Catholikes* would vse them very sparingly, for feare of scandalizing the poore decaued Protestants.

Obserue

OF THE WORSHIPPING OF SAINTS. OR

Obscure lastly, chiefly the outward manner and externall shew of worshipping, it cannot be sufficiently discerned, whether it be Divine, Religious, or Civill: for as we kneele to God, so doe we also on our knee honour the King, and his Councell, *As David did adore King Saul prostrate on the earth.* But the difference consisteth chiefly in the inward conceits, and disposition of the minde; and so whether we knoele or no (if we prostrate our hearts before God, inclining to him, as to the Author of all things, infinitely perfect) we doe him Godly honour. So, if we kneele to any Saints, or before any picture of a Saint in honour of the Saint, acknowledging in our hearts the Saint to be a very holy creature, indued with many great graces of God, and dearly beloved of him; we doe but duly worshipping the Saint: as kneeling to the King, and in our hearts confessing him to be the supreme Governour vnder God of the temporall state of his Kingdome; we doe but our duties vnto our King. To conclude, it is not the outward fashion of worshipping, that maketh it proper to God or Man; when as kneeling to one, may be also in dishonour of him; as when Pilates souldiers kneeled to Christ: but the inward conceits and inclination of the judgement and heart. And therefore, they are very simple that reprehend *Catholikes* of Idolatry for kneeling before pictures; when as they kneele not to the picture it selfe; no more then *Protestants* kneele vnto that part of their seats, or to the wall that is before them; but they doe kneele to God, as to their soveraigne Lord; and to the Saint as to an holy personage, whose prayer to God for them they humbly request.

Now to the maine point in controvertise, *M. PER* denyeth That any civill worshipping in bending of the knee, or prostrating of the body, is to be giuen to either Saints or Angels; and much lesse any religious worshipping, as namely invocation, signified by any bodily adoration: for that (saith he) is the honour of God himselfe, by what name soever you call it. And this is all he saith (for ought I can see) touching the worshipping of Saints.

We on the other side say, that we may both bend the knee, and prostrate the body to any Angell or Saint in heaven; and with a religious inclination and obedience of our hearts worshipping them; for their excellent supernatural gifts: and that this kinde of worshipping, is much inferior vnto the honour proper to God; yea, that it is infinitely lesse, then that as hath bene already declared. *M. PER* hath one only shadowe of a reason, why we must not yeeld any civill worship vnto the Saints: Because (saith he) they be absent from vs, and we see not the worshippers that be absent, ergo. Which is most easily confuted; and that two wayes. First, if we saye (as we will prone after ward) that though they be farre distant from vs in place; yet, they see and knowe all the honour that we present to them; and

and so are they morally present, and as so present may be worshipped. Secondly, that we may truly honor them who are absent corporally, by lifting up our hearts to them, and so representing them to our mindes may reverence and worship them as spiritually present, according to that of S. Paul; *I absent in body, but present in spirit*: otherwise, yve Christians, *1. Cor. 5.* should not vvholes we liued on earth, adore the humanity of our Saviour, *vers. 3.* Christ IESVS, because he touching his humanity, is absent from vs, which were most absurd: and so is therefore M. PERKINS reason, out of vvhich it would necessarily followe. And because M. PERKINS confoundeth this point of worshipping of Saints with that of inuocation, and hudleth them together, nowe talking of the one, then of the other, besides al good methode and order; and consequently maketh two Chapters of the same matter: I will here in this former Chapter only treat of the worshipping of Saints, drawing what M. PERKINS saith of this subject into this Chapter, and referre the matter of inuocation vnto the next.

His second reason then against worshipping of Saints, may be that which maketh the third in the 14. Chapter: *Christ refused so much as to bowe the knee vnto Satan, vpon this ground: because it is written, thou shalt worshippinge the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serue.*

To this S. Augustine hath answered 1200. yeares agoe, vpon those vvordes of Genesis: *Abraham adored or worshipped the people of this land.* In *Cap. 23.* may be demanded (saith he) howe it is written thou shalt adore thy Lord God, and *Quest. 61.* him only shalt thou serue: when as Abraham did so kinde a backward of people, *super Gen.* that he did adore them; but we must obserue that in the same Commandment, it is *nosin.* not said, thou shalt only adore thy Lord thy God; but it saith, him only shalt thou serue, which in Greeke is *Latrias*, for such seruise is due to God only. So that in briefe this most learned Father answereth our Protestants, that the seruice proper to God (called *Latria*) is to be giuen to none but to God: Marry, that worship and adoration exprest in the former part of that sentence, may be giuen to others, and that Abraham gaue it very well vnto the people of *Heb.* Nowe, our Saviour had great reason, not to yeeld so much as one iote of that meaner worship to Satan; because he excelled him in nothing, but small reason haue our Protestants to reason thus (as in effect M. PERKINS doth) Christ would not worship the Deuill, therefore Christians may not worship Saints, as though Saints were no more to be worshipped then the Deuill: a holy comparison and well worthy a hell-hound. But he goeth forward and addeth, that Peter would not suffer Cornelius so much as to kneele to him: though (saith he) Cornelius intended not to honour him as God: therefore, neither Saint nor Angell is to be honoured so much as with the bowing of the knee, if it carry but the least signification of diuine honors.

Answer. Doe you marke yvhat vvarre this man is at vvith himselfe first he saith *that Cornelius intended not to adore Peter as God*: after he addeth, *that kneeling is to carry but the signification of Godly honour, it was so becomen to Saints*; which conclusion of his we grant, to vvit: that no inward or outward vvorship (if it proceede from a hart meaning to exhibite diuine honour) is to be giuen vnto any other then to God; and therefore did I declare before, that by the externall kinde of vvorshipping, we cannot discerne whether the party meane to offer diuine, religious, or ciuill honour to him whome he honoureth, but that is to be knowne of the party himselfe, or by conjecture to be otherwise collected. To the purpose, if *Cornelius* meane to adore *S. Peter* as some petty God (as *S. Hierome* gathereth out of the text, which hath; *that he did adore S. Peter falling at his feete*, and *S. Peter* lifting him vp said; *arise, my selfe also am a man*;) then is there nothing against vs, who doe also forbidde all men to adore and giue Godly honour vnto any Saint or Angell. If it were a lesser kinde of religious vvorship, which was due to Saints; then we say with *S. Chrysostome* vpon this place, that *S. Peter* out of his humility and consideration of humane frailty, refused that honour albeit it vvore due vnto his excellent piety and singular authority. The like answer is to be giuen vnto that place of the *Apocalypse*, vvhere the Angell forbade *S. Iohn* to adore him: which *M. P.* had forgot to allage. For either *S. Iohn* took the Angell to be God, as he spake in the person of God; and so by mistaking the person offered him diuine honour, as *S. Augustine* supposeth, and vvvas iustly reprehended by the Angell; and instructed that he vvvas not God, but his fellowe seruant: or (as many other ancient and learned Authours thinke) *S. Iohn* at one that very well knewe what he had to doe, did dutifully vvorship such an heavenly creature, as Gods Ambassadour to him: for otherwise he vvvas not so dull or forgetfull, as to haue the second time fallen into the same fault. Neither did the Angell reprehend him, but after a most courteous manner willed *S. Iohn* not to doe him that honour; because he knowe well howe dearly beloued *S. Iohn* vvvas vnto our Sauour, and that perhaps *S. Iohn* vvvas to haue a higher seate in heaven, then he had; vvherefore, he vvould not take that honour of so great a personage. To these reasons of *M. P.* we may adde some fewe scraps of authorities which he hath swept together.

Augustine: we honour the Saints with charity, and not by seruitude; neither doe we erect Churches to them: And they are to be honoured for imitation; but not to be adored with religion.

Answer. Marke that in both the sentences, he teacheth vs plainly to honour and vvorship the Saints; as we doe honour the Saints, they are to be honoured

Lib. contra Vigil.

Cap. 19. vers. 10.

Quaest. 62. in Genes. Greg. lib. 27. Moral. c. 11. Bed. Anselm. & alij in illud locum.

Cap. 22. vers. 8.

De vera relig. 53.

honoured: Marry he addeth (as we also teach after him) that *an diuine and Godly honour* be giuen them; vvhich he describeth in those wordes, *with seruinde and with religion*. The Saints (saith he euen here, as in many other places of his learned vvorkes) are to be vvorshipped; but not vvith such vvorshippe, as seruants or creatures owe to their soueraigne Lord or creator: they are to be honoured but not vvith religion, being taken precisely for the chiefe act of religion which concerneth only the honor and vvorshippe of God. Churches are not to be builded to Saints, nor Altars erected to them, nor Sacrifice offered to them. All this we graunt in such sort as *S. Augustine* himselfe doth declare, that is: these diuine offices are to be performed to no other then to God alone; yet, all may be done in the memory, and to the honour of Saints. Let this one place of *S. Augustine* serue the turne, where he saith: that *Christian people* doe celebrate the memory of *Martins* vvith religious solemnity; both to stirre vp imitation, as also *cor. Faust.* that they may be partakers of their merits, and helped by their prayers: nor vvith-
 standing (saith he) is none of the *Martins* doe we erect Altars, but to the God of *Martins*; yet, in the remembrance of *Martins*. For vvho of the Priests, in the places of their holy bodies standing at the Altar, hath said at any time: we offer vvith thee Peter, or Paul, or Cyprian? But that vvhich is offered, is offered to God (vvho crowned the *Martins*) in the memories of *Martins*; that by the ad-
 miration of the very places, a greater deuotion may arise to enflame our charity, both to vvardes them vvhome we must imitate; as also to vvardes him, by vvhose helpe we may imitate them. We therefore, vvorship the *Martins* vvith that vvorship of lone and society, vvherewvith holy men of God in this life are vvorshipped, &c. but vvith so much more deuotion, as we are more assured that they haue now passed all perill of this life. Obserue (good reader) how many points of the *Catholike* doctrine are confirmed by this one passage of so vvorthy a Doctor.

First, Altars are built at the *Martins* bodies. Secondly, Sacrifice is offered to God at the memories of the *Martins*, to encrease our lone to vvardes them. Thirdly, *Martins* are to be vvorshipped of vs, more then any holy men liuing. Fourthly, That vvith religious honour and celebraty they are to be vvorshipped; yet not vvith any Godly honour, as by Sacrifice, erecting of Altars, or building of Churches to them; vvhich seeme to be the only externall actes of religion proper vnto God alone.

M. PARKINS second testimony is taken out of *Epiphanius*, vvho com-
 mandeth that none be adored but God alone. Let Mary be in honour, but let *Heres.*
 God only be adored. Againe, Mary is holy and to be honoured, but not to ad-
 ration.

Answer. Vvho seeth not, that this holy Father teacheth vnto honour and vvorshippe the blessed Virgin Mary and the other Saints? Marry not

116 OF THE WORSHIPPING OF SAINTS. &c.

with Sacrifice, as he there disparteth against them vvhho offered Sacrifice to the Virgin Mary. or any other such like adoration vvhich is proper to God alone.

Lib. 9. A third testimony M. P.ER. produceth against himselfe out of S. Cyril, **& 10.** when Iulian the Apostate objected against the ancient Catholikes (that which Protestants doe against vs nowe a dayes) that they worshipped their *Martirs as God*: Cyril (saith M. P.ER.) answereth then plainly (as we Catholikes doe nowe) that Christians (indeede) did honour their Martirs, but not with adoration and Godly honour. His wordes are: We affirm not our Martirs to be made Gods, but we vse to bestowe all honour vpon them.

In primu The fourth and last testimony is borrowed out of S. Ambrose. Is any so **cap. Rom.** madde that he will giue to the Earle, the honour of a King? yet, these men doe not thinke themselves guilty, who giue the honour of Gods name to a creature, and leaving their Lord adore their fellowe seruants, as though there were any thing more lesse for God.

Answer. S. Ambrose therein euigeth (as S. Paul doth) against Idolaters, that gaue the glory of God, some to men their fellowe seruants, some to fowles, some to serpents, and such like: all vvhich is very farre vvide from the marke of the present question. For he that condemneth men for giuing Gods honour to foolish or beaustly creatures, doth not reprehend them which honour and worship Gods seruants, with such honour only as is due to them. And thus much in confutation of M. P.ER. reasons against worshipping of Saints: nowe to an argument or two in fauour of the Catholike party.

Rom. 13. All men are to be honoured by the lawe of nature, with such honour as is cor- **vers. 7.** respondent and due vnto their vertue and dignity; which the Apostle confirmeth saying *render to all men their due, &c. to whome honour, honour, &c. but a kinde of religious and supernaturall honour and worship is due vnto the Saints in heauen: ergo, we are bound to render that their due worship vnto them.*

That religious honour is due vnto them, is most cleare to all that know vvhich honour is due vnto any man. If honour be due vnto Nobility of birth, as it is commonly holden; the Saints are the Sonnes of God, the most honourable Lord of heauen and earth. If to be admitted to be one of a Kinges priuy Councell, maketh a man honourable; then the Saints are honourable, who (as S. Paul saith) doe see God face to face, and knowe him, **1. Cor. 13.** *whom as they are knowe.* If to be aduanced vnto some high gouernement, **vers. 12.** make a man honourable; the Martirs whome Christ doth place to rule o- **apocal. 2.** ver. 27. *uer Cyren and Nations,* are honourable. Briefly, if excellent vvidome, singular valour, and such like heroyall vertues, make men honourable, as all men confesse; then are the Saints in heauen most honourable, vvhich

so farre exceeded in all such heroycall vertues of which the Philosophers
 vvvrite, all others as farre as heauen surpasseth the earth: so that it remaineth
 most euident, that the Saints are to be worshipped. And as their excel-
 lent vertues doe proceede from a more noble fountayne, then the na-
 ture of man (to wit) from the grace of God, and doeth therefore without
 comparison, surmount all morall and ciuill either vertue or dignity: so
 are they with a more spirituall and religious kinde of worship to be vvor-
 shipped and reuerenced. It may be said, that albeit the Saints be so very
 honourable: yet, because they be of another region they are not to be ho-
 noured by vs, that be strangers and foraigners to them: but this objecti-
 on *S. Paul* hath long since preuented, who saith expressely to Christi-
 ans: *Brethren ye are not guests and strangers, but Citizens of Iude Saints, and* Ephef. 2.
household seruants of God. If then one Citizen be to reuerence another his
 better, and one seruant another, then are we to worship the Saints in hea-
 uen, who are our fellowe Citizens and seruants: yea, they are members
 of the same body of Christ, of which we are, though they be now in tri-
 umph for their lawfull fighting here, and we yet in warfare, to attayne
 vnto the same triumphanc estate. Yea, for the deare and mutuall affection,
 vvhich is or should be betwene these two partes of the said Church,
S. Paul calleth that *Hierusalem which is above our Mother*: and ought we Gal. 4.
 not to reuerence, honour, and vvorship our Mother: thus much of our
 former argument grounded in reason. vers. 26.

Nowe to another taken from example, which alone is more then suffi-
 cient to settle any good Christian in the faith of this point, thus it may be
 propounded: Both *Iewes*, *Pagans*, and *Heresikes* (that is, all sortes of vn-
 godly and misbeleeuing men) did finde great fault with the auncient true
 Christians for worshipping of Saints and their Relikes, and called it Ido-
 latri, as the *Protestants* doe nowe a dayes: Contrary wise, the best and
 most learned Doctors in that pure antiquity, did maineayne and defend
 vvorshipping of Saints and their Relikes, teaching just as the *Catholikes*
 nowe doe: that they did indeede honour the Saints vvith great honour,
 but did not adore them, or giue the honour proper to God to any other
 then to God alone; let vs heare some prooffe of this. When blessed *Poli-*
carpus S. Iohn Euangelists Disciple was Martired, the *Iewes* were very im-
 pudent to haue his body consumed to ashes, lest (say they) the Christi-
 ans doe gette it and so leaning vpon the crucified man, doe fall to adore him. to the Eusebius
 pinion of the *Iewes*. What answered the Christians? We (say they) meane cap. 14.
 nothing lesse then to forsake Christ; for him we adore as the true Sonne of God:
 but Martirs and all other his true seruants we doe vvorthily reuerence and embrace,
 for their incredible good vvill shewed towards Christ; and doe esteeme their bones

OF THE WORSHIPPING OF SAINTS, &c

and yet like more rich then precious stones, and more pure then gold, and doe celebrate their memories, with holy dayes and great joy. This of the ancient Christians answer to the Jewes, nowe of their answer to the Pagani. Iulian the *Apostate* with his followers, charged the Christians with making their *Martirs* Gods; and that they adored them: to vvhome among others

L. 6. cont. Cyril Patriarke of *Alexandria* answered in this manner. *We make not holy Iulianum.* *Martirs* Gods, neither doe we adore them: but we honour them very highly. And

it is not an vnworthy thing to say, it is necessary to honour them eternally, that haue behoued themselves so gloriously. And because that goodly man (*Iulianus*) doth reprehend vs for worshipping of them, we tell him, that we esteeme not *Martirs* to be Gods, yet are we accustomed to vouchsafe them very high honour. After these *Pagani* and Iewes some old *Heretikes* trotted apace. *Faustina* the *Manichee* *Heretike* calumniated and falsly slandered the *Catholikes* of

her time, that they had turned their *Martirs* by worshipping of them, into *Idols*. Vvho vvhome *S. Augustin* that vvorthy pillar of the Church answered, as is aboue rehearsed: That Christians (indeede) did celebrate the

Aug. l. 10. memory of *Martirs* with religious solemnity, and that they worshipped them

co. Faust. with greater honour then they did any holy man a liue; yet, not with that honour

cap. 21. which is proper to God, called by the *Greekes* *Latria*. The like did *Vigilantius* another dreaming *Heretike* object shortly after, auouching the *Catholikes*

to be *Idolaters*, because they adored the bones of dead men: whome that great light of his age *S. Hierome* doth duly reprehend, answering; That

Epist. ad they did not adore *Martirs* selber, no nor any *Angell* in heauen, because they

Romanus. would not giue the honour due to the *Creator*, vnto any creature: but (saith he)

we doe honour the relikes of *Martirs*, that we may adore him whose *Martirs* they be. We doe honour the seruants, that the honour of the seruants may redound vnto

their master, who saith, he that receiueh you, receiueh me: nowe let the indifferēt Christian consider, vvhether he were better vvith the *Heathens*,

Jewes, and *Heretikes*, to denie the *Saints* to be worshipped, and say vvith them that it is *Idolatri* so to doe: or vvhether he had not rather vvith

the auncient holy *Fathers*, and best Christians to hold, that *Saints* departed this life, and their relikes are to be worshipped with greater honour,

then any holy creature liuing: yea, that vvorshipping of *Saints* is so farre of from *Idolatri*, and robbing God of the honour proper to him, that euen thereby God is much honoured. Surely, we *Catholikes* are nothing

diffinided at their out-cries, that call vs therefore *Idolaters*; being vvell assured, that they be but the old alarmes and reproaches, that *Infidels* were

vvornt to cast vpon the best Christians. Nowe to the third and last argument for vs which is taken from authority.

• Iosue 5.

vers. 24.

Nam. 22.

• *Iosue* falling flat vpon the ground worshipped an *Angell*, as soone as he had

told

OF THE WORSHIPPING OF SAINTS. &c.

told him that he was the Prince of Gods army: this worship being performed by a true Israelite, and accepted off by the Angell of God (yea more then that, for it was also commanded) doth conuince, that more then ciuill honour is due vnto a Cyrtizen of heauen: this for the old Testament. For the state of the newe heareth the judgement of the most auncient and best learned Doctores.

Iustine Martyr declaring vnto the Emperor the faith of the Church, *Apolog. 2.* speakeeth thus: We Christians adore and worship God the Father, and his Sonne, who came into the world and taught vs these thinges; and after them doe we truly worship by word and deede, the army of good Angels following his conduct, and the Prophetically spirits: and this doe we copiously teach to all that will learne our doctrine.

Eusebius Caesariensis teacheth the same, and saith: We do honour the Soules of true Godlinesse, as them who are best beloved of God. *Lib. 13. de prop. 7.*

So doth S. Augustine: Therefore dearly beloved Brethren, as often as we celebrate the memoriall of Martirs, laying aside all worldly businesse, we ought speedily to repaire vnto the house of God, to render unto them honour, who haue procured our saluation by the shedding of their blood, who haue offered them (classe) vp to God so holy an Host, to obtayne for vs mercy at his handes, specially when almightie God saith to his James: he that honoureth you, honoureth mee, and he that despiseth you, despiseth me. Whosoever therefore (concludeth S. Augustine) honoureth Martirs, honoureth Christ: and he that contemneth the Saints, contemneth Christ; which is word for word taken out of S. Ambrose. *Serm. 6. in fine.*

S. Chrysostome: We doe not worship auncient Saints and those of later time, in different sort; but all of them with the same obsequies: therefore (saith he) let vs often visite them, and worshippinge their tombes. *Orat. de SS. Iuult. & Max. in Theod. Mat.*

Gregory Nyssens, speaking of the worship which the Church doth giue to Martirs, saith: To what King is such honour done? who are they of the most excellent among men, whose memory is so solemnly honoured? who of the Emperors in so many mouthes, are so renowned as this same Soldier, who was called a Soldier, whom S. Paul hath named, whom the Angels haue attended, and whom Christ hath crowned.

S. Gregory Nazianzene defineth the worshipping of Martirs, to be an assured marke of our love toward Christ. An hundred such other testimonies will the holy auncient Fathers afford vs, if we stand in neede of them. But this may suffice to enforme any reasonable man, that both by expresse warrant of Scripture, and by the practise and doctrine of the pure antiquity, the Saints of God and holy personages are to be worshipped of vs with that religious honour commonly called Dulia, that is: with that worshippinge which is due vnto the better sort of Gods seruants.

OF INTERCESSION OF SAINTS.

OVR CONSENT.

M. PERKINS Page 258.

Our consent I will set downe in two conclusions. The first conclusion: The Saints departed pray to God, by giving thanks to him for their owne redemption, and for the redemption of the whole Church of God upon earth.

The second conclusion. The Saints departed pray generally for the state of the whole Church.

THE DISSENT.

They hold that the Saints in heauen doe make intercession for particular men: and thus having received particular mens prayers, they present them unto God; but this doctrine doe we flatly renounce vpon these groundes and reasons.

Isay 63. The Church saith to God: doublesse thou art our Father though Abraham be ignorant of vs, and Isaac knowe vs not. Nowe if Abraham knewe not his posterity, howe can Mary, nor Peter nor any Saint departed knowe vs and our estate: and consequently they cannot make particular intercession for vs.

To this vve answer two wayes, first vvith S. Hierome vpon the same place: that to knowe one is taken there for to like and approue him and his doings, as it is very often in holy Scripture; Our Lord knoweth the way of the iust. Item, Christ vvill answer to them that were workers of iniquity, I knowe you not; as also to the foolish Virgins, I knowe you not, that is, I like you not: euen so Abraham and Isaac could not then knowe, that is, approue the doing of those their wicked and degenerate children. Secondly vve answer, that Abraham and the holy Patriarkes vvere (vntill Christ) by his passion paid their ranfome) not yet in the possession of heavenly joyes; but detayned in a place of rest, by the learned commonly called *Lymbo Patrum*. To this second answer M. PER. replyeeth; If vvithout the *Lymbo* vverein *Lymbo* (which they will haue to be a part of hell) the Saints dwelt aswarthome in Abrahams bosome: and vvith what comfort could they see his death bedde: O Lord I haue vvayed for thy saluation: We reioyne; that albeit *Lymbo* be thought to be vnder the earth, yet is it as farre removed from hell, as the depth of the earth will giue it leaue; for the place of *Purgatory* is betwene hell and in. Further, that in *Lymbo* there was no payne, but a quiet expectation of their deliuerance from thence; and

and translation into heaven; vvhich brought them great joy: besides, the good company of many millions of holy soules, that there attended the same happy houre of their deliuerance; of all vvhich *Lazarus* vvas partaker being carryed into *Abrams* bosome. I vwill here omit, that *M. PER.* in this very question, maketh this matter of *Lazarus* but a parable, and thereby not fit to confirme any point of doctrine in his owne judgement. To the second place I say, that *Isaiah* might haue great comfort to thinke vpon his saluation, vvhich should be accomplished in Christs time: for *Abram* who was father of them, rejoyced to see Christs *Isa. 8. dyes, which he sawe, and was glad,* as our Saviour himselfe testifieth. *vers. 56.*

The second reason: *Huldah the Prophetesse* telleth *Iosias*, that he must be gathered to his fathers, and put in his graue in peace, that his eyes might not see all the euill, which God would bring on that place. Therefore, the Saints departed see not the state of the Church on earth: this conclusion *Augustine* confirmeth at large. *2. Reg. 22. vers. 20.*

To this vve answer, first, that the Prophetesse (when shee saith, he should not see the euill of that place) meaneth no more, then that he should be after his death in such a place of rest and contentment; that it should not grieue and vex him to see the just punishment of his owne Country. Secondly, it may be said of *Iosias* who dyed long before Christ, as it is of *Abram*; that he vvas to remayne in *Lybba* when that euill should happen, and so should not see it. But *Augustine* (saith he) doth confirme this conclusion at large. VVhy did not the honest man quote the place of *S. Augustine* as he is wont to doe? was it because it would leade vs directly to the discovery of his deceit? *S. Augustine* (indeede) doth very copiously handle the question, what knowledge soules departed haue; and resol- *De cura ueth: that soules departed, of their owne nature all knowledge doe not vnderstand* *promor. ca. 15. 16.* what is done by their friends here; but that either by the report of other soules that come to them, or of Angels that goe betweene; or else by the reuelation of the Spirit of God (in whose presence Saints departed doe continually stand) they may verily well knowe, that which is here done: and thus much of *S. Augustine* in this place, afterward you shall heare more of him concerning his opinion of the knowledge that Saints haue of our affaires.

The third reason of *M. PERKINS*: No Creature, Saint, or Angell, can be a Mediator for vs to God, sauing Christ alone: for in a true Mediator there must be three things. First, that the word of God must reueale and propound him vnto the Church. Surely I should thinke that he must first be a perfect Mediator, before he be propounded for such a one. Secondly, a Mediator must be perfectly just, so as no sinne be found in him at all. Such be all Saints in heauen. Thirdly, a Mediator must be a propitiator: that is, he must bring to God

Some thing, that may appease and satisfie his wrath for our sinnes: so did *Moses* when he appeased Gods wrath, justly kindled against the finnes of the *Israelites* in the wilderness: thus might a man quickly answer *Moses* argument of his Mediatour.

But to explicate this matter more clearly and particularly, I say that a Mediatour may be taken two waies. First, he may be called a Mediatour, that doth in any sort imploy himself betwene two parties to agree them, whether it be by perswasion or intreaty; whether by letter or word of mouth: and so is it commonly taken, and that according vnto the proper signification of the word. Secondly, a Mediatour may be taken in another sence, not for every one that useth meanes of attonement; but for him only that so make the agreement betwene the parties, is content to pay the debt himselfe, and to satisfie for al other damages and detriments.

1. Tim. 2. and in this sence doth *S. Paul* say: *That we haue one Mediatour the man Iesus vs Christ, who gaue himselfe a redemption for all.* Note the latter wordes, and you shall see this my distinction of Mediatour to be gathered out of the Apostles owne wordes: For (saith he) *we haue one Mediatour, that gaue himselfe a redemption for all,* that is, that tooke the debts of all our sinnes vpon his owne shoulders, and satisfied fully for all: see here exprest the second kinde of Mediatour. Nowe in the beginning of the Chapter, he desireth that intercessions and prayers be made of the Christians for all men, *yea for Heathen Princes*: behold the first kinde of Mediatour. For Christians that pray for all men, by their intercession are meanes vnto God for conversion of others, and so may be called Mediatours in a good sence, as *Moses* saith of himselfe: *I was an intercessour and meanes, or mediatour betwene our Lord and you.* And by *S. Paul* he is plainly called a Mediatour: *the law was ordyned by Angels, in the hand of a Mediatour.* And by *S. Stephen* he is called a Redeemer: as *Orboniel* is termed a Saviour. And that in this sence there may be many mediatours *S. Cyril* testifieth, saying: *The Mediatour of God and man is Iesus Christ, not only because he reconciled men vnto God; but for that he is naturally both God and man in one person. For by this meanes God reconciled our natures to him, for otherwise howe should S. Paul haue said, Christ to be the only Mediatour: for many of the Saints haue vsed the ministry of mediation; as S. Paul himselfe, crying vpon men to be reconciled to God: and Moyses was a Mediatour, for he ministred the law vnto the people: and Ieremy was also a Mediatour, when he stood before God and prayed for good*

Related in things to the people. What need many wordes? (saith this great Doctor) all the Prophets and Apostles were Mediatours. VVith *S. Cyril* accordeth *Nice. art. S. Basil*, who hoped for mercy at Gods handes, and forgiveness of his sinnes by the mediation of the holy Prophets, Apostles, and Martirs. And *S. Bernard*

was

was of the same minde, when he taught that we stand in need of a Mediator, *Serm. 5.* to the Mediator: and no one more for our profit and commodity: then the *per. sign.* blessed Virgin Mary; so that this mediation and intercession of Saines, is no *magna.* whit at all injurious vnto the only mediation of Christ: for it is of a farre *apparit.* different kind from Christes mediation, and of the same sort as the pray, *incels.* ers be of other good men liuing on earth; who all sue vnto God in Christ name, and hope to obayne (all and euery of them) their petitions, by the vertue of his merits; and therefore all our prayers and cheues, are commonly concluded thus: *Through our Lord Iesus Christ thy Sonne, who with thee liueth and reigneth in the vniuersity of the holy Ghost, God, for euer and euer.* And thus much M. P. foundation laide vpon the sandes; where in he so insolently renounced the Catholike doctrine: but that I doe him no wrong, I must here adde a couple of other arguments which he misplaceth in the former question, and therefore I refered them to this.

The former. All true inuocation and prayer, made according vnto the will of God, must haue a double foundation: a commandement, and a promise. A commandement to inuade us to pray: and a promise to assure vs that we shall be heard: for euery prayer must be made in faith; and without a commandement, and promise thereto is no faith. Vpon this infallible ground I conclude, that we may not pray to Saines departed: for in the Scripture there is no word either commanding vs to pray to them, or assuring vs that we shall be heard when we pray.

Answer. We deny that prayer requireth that double foundation of a commandement to pray, and promise to be heard when we pray: and that vpon the varrant of some of the best prayers, that are recorded in holy Scripture. When Abraham prayed for the sauing of Sodom, and Gomorrah, *Gen. 18.* and did obayne that if there had beene in them but tenne iust persons, *vers. 25.* their Cities should not haue beene destroyed; we reade neither of commandement giuen to Abraham to make that prayer, nor any promise before he beganne it, to be heard; and this man was the Father of the faithfull, and knewe much better then an hundreth M. PARKINS, howe and when to pray.

And vwhen milde Moyses that most wise conductor of the Israelites, prayed vnto God so peremptorily, that he would either blot him out of the *Exod. 32.* booke of life, or else pardon his people the Israelites, had he either commandement to pray, or promise to be heard? I am sure that they can shewe me none at all in the Scripture: Nay, God before entreated Moyses, that he would not pray vnto him for them, but suffer him to punish them according to their deserts, promising to aduance Moyses exceedingly, if he would giue ouer his sute; neuerthelesse, Moyses omitted not to pray most earnestly for the same people, and vvas heard. Neede vve any other

Q. ij.

proofe

proofe to ouerthrowe M. PER. rotten foundation: And vvhien Iesus rather commanded then prayed; that the Sonne should not mane against Gabaon, and it stayed his course for a whole day space, God obeying vnto the voice of man; as the holy Ghost speaketh: vvhhat commandement or promise had Iesus for this? and to omit an hundredth other like, what promise had S. Paul to assure him to be heard, when he prayed not once, but thrise *2. Cor. 12.* *vers. 8.* *that the prickes of the flesh should be taken away from him?* none at al (I weene) for his request would not be granted him. By this the indifferent reader may perceiue, how grosse the Protestants judgement is in matters of faith, vvho take that for an infallible ground of religion, vvwhich is so contrary vnto the expresse vvord of God, that nothing can be more. Of faith necessary in prayer shall be spoken, as soone as I haue dispatched another text of Scripture, misplated here and misapplied.

Math. 4. *vers. 10.* We are (saith M. PER.) commanded to call vpon God only: him only shalt thou serue.

This mans cie-sight beginneth to faile him much, that cannot discern betwene calling vpon, and seruing; when many a Master calleth vpon his man whome he doth not serue, but is serued by him. The text is already expounded out of S. Augustine: that we must serue God only with Godly honour, as the Greeke vvordes *Latrein* doth therein notifie; notwithstanding which only seruice, euery seruant (I hope) may serue his Master; and euery inferior vvorship his superiour and so may we doe the Saints our betters in all goodnesse, with such vvorship as is due vnto their singular gifts. And as we may pray vnto men alie vvithout derogation vnto God his only seruice; so may we doe to the Saints departed.

But M. PER. feareing the weakenesse of this fortification, secondeth it with an other out of the Apostle: *Rom. 10.* *vers. 14.* *Howe shall we call vpon him in whom we haue not beleeu'd? but we may not beleue in Saints; therefore we may not call vpon them.*

I answere, that we cannot call vpon any man for more then we beleue to be in him; and so much must we beleue to be in euery man, as we will demand at his handes. We call vpon Christ for saluation, and therefore must we first beleue him to be a Sauour: we call vpon Saints to pray for vs; therefore must vve before hand beleue, that they both can and will pray for vs, and that they are able (through the fauour and loue that God beareth them) to entreate much at Gods handes: see howe vve must beleue in them, vpon whome we call for helpe. And the very phrased *Phil. 4.* *vers. 10.* *belieuing in Saints,* is vsed by the same Apostle, not vnlike that of the old Testament: *Exod. 14.* *vers. 31.* *The people beleued God, and his seruants Moyses.* M. PERKIN goeth on, patching vp his former argument with that, which hath small coherence

coherence with it, to wit: *That we haue no promise to be heard, but for Christs sake.* Admit it vvereso, it maketh nothing against prayer to Saints: for they pray for vs in Christs name, and are heard for Christs sake.

Finally, M. PERKINS saileth, that we giue for our only warrant of inuocation of Saints, miracles and revelations; and thereunto answereth, that to iudge of any point of doctrine by miracles, three things must concurre. First, the doctrine of faith and piety can be confirmed. Secondly, prayer to God that some thing may be done for the ratifying of the said doctrine. Thirdly, the manifest edification of the Church by the two former.

What of all this good Sir? Marry thinke what you vwill, for he interteth nothing; I will therefore apply all this to the purpose, and say first: That when a miracle is granted by God, to confirme any point of doctrine in controuersie, then euery man is as vuell bound to beleue that point of doctrine, as if it were plainly recorded in the holy Scripture; for it hath God to witness, who cannot deceiue. Secondly, that S. Bernard (almost Godly man, and one whose testimony M. PERKINS doth very often alleage) did fulfill all those three worthy obseruations of M. PERKINS in working of miracles to confirme inuocation of Saints; and therefore it is to be beleued of all men, euen by M. PERKINS owne sentence. For

first he propounded inuocation of Saints, as a doctrine of faith and great piety, in the Prouinee of Tolouse in France; where it was by our Protestants Lib. 3. v. Grandfathers the Abigines denied. Secondly, he blessed some certain loaves of bread that were presented to him, and prayed to God that if inuocation to Saints were pure doctrine of faith, that then whosoener should taste of that bread, might be cured of what disease soeuer he was sicke. A Bishop that stood by, added, yea Sir, if they receiue them with good faith they shall be healed. S. Bernard replied: I said not so, but whosoener shall truly taste of them shall be cured, that they may know vs to haue the truth; and so be the true messengers of God. And as it there followeth: An huge multitude of sicke and diseased persons tasting of that bread, recovered perfect health. If we had no other argument then this, it alone were sufficient to perswade any Christian, that so pray vnto Saints is the true doctrine of Christ, which God so expressly would confirme by miracles, and testify so evidently. What would he beleue, that will not beleue this? But (saith M. PERKINS) miracles be to be done for Infidels, and not for them who beleue. True it is, and therefore was this miracle done, to conuert or to confound such Infidels as our Protestants are, vwho will not beleue the inuocation of Saints.

Lastly (saith he) our faith is not to be confirmed by revelations, and apparitions of dead men, but by the writings of the Apostles and Prophets. Luc. 16. vers. 29.

What is this either to miracles, or inuocation of Saints? neither is that

which he hath to be drawne out of those wordes of that parable, as I will proue when it shall be neede. Note by the way, chat twice in this questi- on he himselfe citeth that parable of *Dives and Lazarus*, for prooffe of do- ctirine; vvhich he afterward denyeth to be lawfull for vs to doe. What our other groundes be for inuocation of Saints, shall be declared in our arguments following.

M. PERAIN'S first reason. *To pray to Saints departed, is to borne the knees to them while they are in heauen, is to ascribe vnto them, that which is proper to God: namely to knowe the hart and inward desires thereof, and to knowe the speeches and behauiours of all men, in all places in the earth at all times.*

Answer. This man doth too too broadly enlarge his lies; for neither doe all men at once (much lesse at all times) pray vnto euery or any one of the Saints: but suppose they did; yet, to heare all their prayers together, is nothing so much as to see that which euery Saint doth see in heauen, to wit, the onely substance of God in three persons; for what are all the cogitations of men, compared vnto the immense and incomprehensible nature of God? not so much as the point of a pinne to the whole globe of the earth, and yet euery Saint in heauen doth clearly behold God here- fore much more able are they to heare and see all things that belong vnto men. And as the learned *Diuites* knowe, the man-hood of our Sauoir Christ doth see, knowe, and comprehend all the deedes, wordes, and thoughts of all men, that haue liued since the beginning of the world, vnto the end; because it belongeth vnto him who is iudge of all, to knowe all; as well to reward the good, as to punish the euill: and yet doth no Di- uine say, that the man-hood of Christ is God, or equall vnto God in knowledge. Nowe, the Saints in heauen doe not see the secretes of our harts, in our harts; but being present to the face of God, doe behold in it (as it were in a most cleare glasse) all that is pleased the goodnesse of God to reueale vnto them; and it is incident, and belonging necessarily vnto their most happy estate, to haue graunted to them, all that in reason they can demand; other wise they were not so happy as they might be. Now, what good nature would not be glad, to pleasure his owne fellows mem- bers and deare friendes; specially such as craue so much at his handes; vvhichfore, it cannot be denyed of any considerate man, but that God who satisfieth al their iust requests doth ordinarily reueale vnto his deare- ly beloved Saints, all the prayers that be made vnto them. Surely *S. Au- gustine* in most expresse termes declareth: *That God can giue such power vnto his Saints and Angels, that they may be present in spirit at euery place through- out the world, where there is any memory of them: or prayer made vnto them.* He will not take vpon him to define, whether they be actually there present

orno, or whether by the ministry of Angels they be relieved that seeke helps by the intercession of Martires: but maketh no question but that they heare all prayers made by whosoever to them, and obtayne very many of their requests. And as *S. Gregory* saith: *What doe they not see,* *Lib. 12.*
see him that seeth all things; yea, containeth all things within himselfe? Yet *Moral.*
M. P. R. blusheth not to say: *that it is but a forgery of mans braine, to imagine* *cap. 13.*
that the God-head is such a cleare glasse, representing all things; because it
should then followe, that the Angels, who behold Gods face, should be ignorant of
nothing: but the Angels haue learned some things of the Church (as S. Paul was
weisseh:) therefore they see not all things in God.

To this we answer, that in God all things are represented, and thine more brightly, then in their owne naturall places: yet, doth not God communicate and reueale all things vnto euery body there present; but his diuine nature in three persons, Christ, God, and Man, with all other naturall and ordinary things, from the cope of heauen to the center of the earth, are seene of euery Citizen of heauen, though with a different degree of clearenes: but of Gods counsels concerning the gouernement of the world, so much is only knowne vnto either Angel or Men, as appertayneth vnto their state, and that when it belongeth vnto them: therefore the Angels might well not knowe many things belonging to the gouernement of the Church, vntill they sawe it accomplished, and therefore might be said to haue learned some such thing of the Church. But as we haue said before, it properly appertayneth vnto the state of Saints in heavenly blisse, to knowe their friendes reasonable requests made vnto them; or else their conditions should not be so perfect, but that they might in equity require the bettering of it: and consequently they could not be so thoroughly contented, as their estate of perfect felicity in heauen doth demande: and thus much of *M. P. R.* reasons. To which I will here add one argument, commonly vsed by the *Protestants*, though *M. P. R.* (for the weakenesse of it perhaps) thought best to omit it: it is taken *ab*
authoritate negative, which Schollers knowe to be naught worth. *Christ Math. 11.*
saith, come yee vnto me all yee that labour and be burdened, and I will refresh you; *vers. 28.*
he saith not goe to the Saints, but come to me. I answer, neither doth he
say, doe not goe to the Saints, and therefore here is nothing against vs.
We goe to Christ for remission of our sinnes, which he more beaues then as
slens of lead vpon our backs, and through our redeemers merites doe we craue
pardon of them: but to moue more effectually his our redeemer, and
God his father to haue pittie vpon vs, we humbly desire the Saints (his
best beloued seruants) to speake a good vword in our behalfe, acknow-
ledging our felices vnvorthy to obtayne any thing at Gods handes,
 through

through our owne vngatefull wickednes. Now that our Saviour Christ
Iesus, doth very well like and approue the mediation of others euen to
himselfe, may be gathered out of very many euident texts of holy Scri-

Matb. 8. cure: for heate the intercession of the Centurion cured his seruant: and *se-*
vers. 13. ing the faith of them that brought a man sicke of the palsy before him, he hea-
Matb. 9. led the sicke man; and *as his disciples request* cured S. Peters mother in law.
vers. 2. And vwhen the vvoman of *Chanaan* liued vnto him for her daughter, *be*
Luc. 4. answered her not a word before his disciples had besought him for her: by
vers. 38. which and many such like recorded in the Gospell, euery man (that is not
Matb. 15. wilfully blinde) may well see, that the intercession of others for vs doth
vers. 23. much preuaile, euen with our soueraigne intercessor and mediator Christ
Iesus himselfe: nowe to his authorities.

Lib. 3. cōt. The first is out of S. *Augustine*, *Christian men commend each other to their*
Parmenia. prayers to God: And who prayeth for all, and for whom none prayeth, beu the
cap. 3. one and true mediator.

I answered, these wordes be rather for vs, for approuing and confessing
our Saviour Christ to be the only mediator of redemption, as we haue
already declared; they teach that all Christians may commend them-
selues each to others prayers: Nowe, the Saints departed be Christians
(I trust) as good as we, or rather farre better; therefore all other Christi-
ans may very well (in S. *Augustine*s iudgement) commend themselves vn-
to the Saints holy prayers, because each one may commend himselfe to
any others prayers. Concerning the word Mediatour, S. *Augustine* ne-
uer attributeth it vnto any, sauing only to our Saviour, taking it alwaies in
the second signification aboue named, to which three things are proper-
ly required, according to S. *Augustine*: first, that he pray for all, and that
none pray for him; which property M. P. E. toucheth, but misquoteth
the place: for it is in *lib. 2. cap. 8. cōt. Parmenianum*. The second proper-
ty and the most necessary of all is, that he pay the full price and ranfome
of all our finnes, and that his redemption may in equall ballance, counter-
poise the grieuoufnesse of our finnes, which is taken out of diuers places
of Scripture. The third which is the ground of al the rest is, that the Me-
diatour be both God and Man; that participating of both natures, he
may be as it vvere a naturall middle or meanes to reconcile the two ex-
tremes; and so as Man, be able to suffer something to appease Gods
wrath; and as God, to giue to that suffering of his man-hood, infinite va-
lue, making thereby Christs sufferings more then sufficient to pay for
the redemption of an hundred vvorldes if neede had beene: And these
properties gathered out of S. *Augustine* and other Fathers, will put
downe M. P. E. oode deuite of properties of a Mediatour; all which
make

Lib. 9. de
ciuitate,
cap. 15.
alibi.

make nothing against the intercession of Saints, who be not in that sense to be called mediators, and yet cease not to pray for vs, let vs then goe on.

M. PERKINS citeth secondly another sentence out of *S. Augustine*, where he bringeth in our Saviour saying: *Thou hast no other way to goe but by me.*

Answer. *S. Augustine* there alludeth vnto those vvordes of our Saviour, *I am the way, the truth, and the life*; and saith, that for life and truth we haue no other way to seeke vnto, but vnto Christ, who according vnto his diuinity, is truth and life vnto the vvorlde. And in this high degree of redemption and mediation, he was the only way vnto his Father: for neither the *Gentiles* by their morall vertues, nor *Iewes* by the power of their law, could without him leade them to God. All this is very good doctrine, but no whit more against praying to Saints, then against commending of vs one to anothers prayers, or vsing any other meanes of saluation, as *S. Augustine* vpon the like occasion doth himselfe plainly declare. For vpon these vvordes of *S. Iohn*: *If any man offend, we haue an advocate with the Father Iesus Christ the just one*, where he putteth this doubt; but some man will say, therefore doe not the Saints pray for vs, doe not the Bishops and gouernours pray for the people? After hee toleth this doubt concluding, that all the members of *Christ* his body doe pray one for another, namely the head prayeth for all: ywhere he most plainly sheweth, that the soueraigne intercession or mediation of Christ the head, doth not exclude the intercession of Saints departed, no more then it doth of any other yet liuing.

M. PERKINS citeth also one sentence out of *S. Chrysostome*, who hath vwritten thus: *Thou hast no neede of Patrones to God, nor much running to De perfi*
and downe to flatter and serue vpon others; for though thou be alone and want a Enangel.
Patrone, and by thy selfe pray vnto God, thou shalt obtayne thy desire.

Answer. It seemeth by his vvordes, of running vp and downe, and seru-
ing of others; (which Gods Saints will not endure) that he speaketh a-
gainst seeking vnto vaine glorious and euill morall men, to be our Pa-
trones to God, which were folly. But admie he meane the Saints depar-
ted; then let vs take his whole meaning, and not wrest his vvordes to any
other sense then he will allowe and like of: he doth then often inough
haue against certayne rich men (who hauing giuen some little almes to
the poore, though themselves sure of pardon of their sinnes, and of salua-
tion, through the poore mens prayers, though they prayed not them-
selues;) and also against all such sluggish lazie persons, as relyed wholly
vpon the intercession of Saints, not praying much for themselves vpon
such as these doth *S. Chrysostome* often call to pray for themselves, and not

to trust wholly vnto the prayers of others; perswading them, that it were better to pray for themselves without Patrones, then leauing all to Patrons not to pray themselves at all. But the best of all to be, both to pray themselves, and to imploy also good men and the Saints to pray for them,

Homil. 7. this is his owne declaration in these his wordes: *Let vs not like sluggards and slouthfull companions, depend wholly vpon the merites of others: for the prayers and supplications of Saints for vs, haue their force, and that surely very great; but truly, when we our selues doe our hall by our penitence request and sue for the same.* And making the like discourse in another place, he concludeth

Homil. 1. thus: *Knowing these things, neither let vs despise the prayers of the Saints, neither let vs cast all vpon them, as if they could do nothing for vs, but*

Thessal. Nowe to the arguments for the Catholike party: my first argument shal be to proue, that we may pray to the Angels in heauen to blesse vs, and to pray for vs; to whome after our blessed Lady, we assigne the first place in our Litanie. We haue for our vvarrant the authority and example of the holy Patriarke *Isaiah*, expressly set downie in holy Scripture for prayer

Genes. 48. to Angels, in these wordes: *God before whom my fathers Abraham and Isaac haue walked, God who hath fedde me from my youth vnto this present day,*

Genes. 48. and the Angel that hath deliuered me from all euill, blesse these children. What can be more plain, then that this blessed old Patriarke did pray vnto his good Angel Guardian? Nay (saith Mr. Peck.) for by the Angel there you may understand Christ; for that in Malachie Christ is signified by the Angel of the covenant: A bonny reason; because that an Angell is once in the old Testament vsed to signifie Christ; therefore it shall signifie him in vvhater place soeuer it shall please the Protestants. Neither doth an Angell in that

Barthol. the place simply our, signifie Christ; but with an addition, the Angel of the covenant, to distinguish that Angell from all others: so that there is no

appearance or colour of likely hood, out of that place so vnlike, to interpret thus. Ieremayneth then, that the vvoid Angell be taken properly (as it is most commonly in holy Scripture) for an heauenly spirit, appointed by God to keepe *Isaiah*: which I consume by the circumstance of the place; because *Isaiah* prayeth vnto that Angell, as to one that was then extant and liuing; that had also before deliuered him from many perils: but Christ was not then borne, nor had any doings in the world, therefore he did not pray to him. Again, the wise Patriarke and Prophet must be made to speake very fondly, if he should pray him that was not in person extant, to blesse those children; he might very well haue prayed God for Christes sake (that was to come) to blesse them: but to pray Christ himselfe, whome he knewe then not to be any where liuing or extant to blesse them, hath no sense in it, for blessing (as all other working)

supposeth

supposeth a recall being and existence of the same party. To this example of *Iacob*, we may joyne the consaile that *Eliphaz* the *Thianie* gaue vnto *Iob*; Turne thy selfe vnto some of the *Saints*, and *Iobs* owne practise. *Hane Iob cap. 5.* pitty on me, haue pitty on me; at least you my friends. Vpon which place *vers. 1.* *S. Augustine* saith, that *Iob* the holy man made intercession to the *Angels*, *Cap. 19.* or to the *Saints* to pray for him; to vvhich we may also adde, howe that another *Tob. c. 12.* *Raphael* offered vp good *Tobies* prayers to God, and howe that another *vers. 12.* *Angell* did giue of the incense of prayers of all *Saints*, vpon the *Altar* of gold *vers. 12.* which is before the throne of God: Out of which places, and such like I *2 Apoc. 8.* frame this argument. *vers. 3.*

The *Angels* be most holy and charitable creatures of themselves; they also haue by Gods appointment charge ouer vs, and doe assist vs; where vpon it followeth most clearely, that they are most ready in vvorde and deede, to further all our good desires and honest demandes: and consequently being by vs requested to pray for vs, cannot refuse it. To say that they haue no care of our prayers, is both contrary to their charity and to their charge, and the places in Scripture already cited: to vvhich this may be added. Christ to discourage men from offending children and little ones, alleageth this inducement: That their *Angels* see the face of his father in heauen, signifying that they would complaine of them to God, and sue for seuerer punishment against such offendours; vvhich argueth, that they doe very well knowe and carefully tender our good: vvhich is also strengthened by an other place, where our Saviour declareth what great joy they make at the conversion of a sinner. Out of all vvhich texts it plainly to be collected, that they knowe of our conuersion, see the particular wrongs that be offered vs, and the good deedes we doe: so that the *Protestants* can finde no starting hole to escape out at; for that they both heare our prayers, and be willing to pray for vs. And hauing wonne the *Protestants* to beginne our *Litanies* with vs, and so to say *S. Michael* pray for vs, all holy *Angels* pray for vs, &c. We may no doubt perswade them to goe forward thus: the *Saints* in heauen are equall vnto *Angels* both in charity, knowledge, affection towards vs, and what else soeuer is requisite vnto intercession; therefore if we may pray vnto *Angels*, we may also pray vnto the *Saints*.

M. PERRINS answereth, that at the generall resurrection *Saints* shall be equall vnto *Angels*, as our Saviour saith, but not before.

Reply. If *Saints* then shall be equall to *Angels*, they are so at their first entrance into possession of the heavenly ioyes; for (as all *Diuines* confesse) the essentiall glory of their soules, shall not be increased at the resurrection; and the glory of their body which they shall then receiue, doth not make them

them more like, but rather more unlike vnto Angels that haue no bodies at all: therefore this and were is insufficient, which Mr. PARKINS foreseeing addeth a second.

Saints be equall to Angels in glory, but not in office and ministry, by which they minister spirits for good men: leaving vs to vnderstand belike, (for the good man doth not expresse it) that because the Angels are ministering spirits, therefore they better knowe our prayers, and are more carefull to pray for vs.

Reply. First, the Saints being of our owne nature, and having passed the like perils that we be in, and being also members of the same body of Christ, as we are, cannot but tender the matter of our saluation, as much as Angels doe, especially considering that their charity towards God bindeth them, to further by all possible meanes his honour and seruice: and their loue towards their neighbours doth moue them sufficiently to second and helpe forward our saluation, in what they can. But the other point of their knowledge of our affaires is of greater difficulty: the which we proue first, by the perfect knowledge they haue of God, which is as great, and also greater then some Angels haue, and so in that cleare mirror of Gods substance they may most easily see all that hath bene, is, or shall be said or done vpon earth. And we say further, that the perfection of their most happy state doth demand as due to it, that they should be made priuy vnto their friends reasonable suites vnto them: All vvhich hath bene already proued. But here I will adde this, which is to the present purpose. That the Saints haue also charge ouer vs, and therefore their belongeth vnto their office, as well as to the office of Angels, to be acquainted with our affaires in particular. That God hath appointed the Saints to rule ouer vs, is proued out of our Sauours wordes, vvhether he saith: *That the good seruant for well vsing of his pound, shall be placed ouer tenne*

Luc. 19. vers. 12. Cyties. And againe, He that shall ouercome, and keep my wordes vntill he
Apoc. 2. vers. 26. I will giue him power ouer Nations, and he shall rule them with a rodde of
iron. See: euen as I haue reuened of my father. Item, I will giue him to sit with
1. Ibid. 3. me vpon my throne. Out of which textes is plainly gathered, that Christ gi-
vers. 21. ueth vnto holy Martirs and Saints, a charge and command ouer Cyties,
Lib. 8. in Countries, and Nations: which the auncient Fathers haue well obserued,
Lucan. doe gouerne ouer vs. so doe they who haue attained vnto the life of Angels. In
De ydnu. another place he calleth the Saints departed salus nostra Praesides: the
In 40. Salvation of our Soules. S. Basil tearmeth them Protectors of mankind.
Mars. Gregory Nazianzene describeth S. Cyprian to be downe vpon him, and to di-
Orat. in uide his speach and life, and to feede his flocke, and to gouerne them together with him.
Cyprian. 112222

Theodorete

Theodore saith, that they at his time that went from home, professed the Martyrs Lib. 8. do
 to be their companions, or rather the guides of their journey: and returning safe and sound
 did yeld them thanks, acknowledging the benefit by them. Many more such
 like testimonies, may be produced out of the auncient learned Fathers if
 neede require, to shewe manifestly howe they vnderstood the Scriptures
 concerning this office and ministry, or rather presidency of the Saints
 departed ouer vs that liue on the earth: vvhich to conclude this rea-
 son, the Saints being equall vnto the Angels, as well in office and ministe-
 ry, as in charity and affection towards vs, we may as well pray vnto them
 as vnto the Angels.

Our third reason shall be to prevent that euasion of theirs, that God
 (forsooth) is so ready of himselfe to heare vs, that we need not any spoken
 man to him: thus I propose it. One of vs liuing here may pray vnto ano-
 ther to pray to God for him, therefore much rather may vve pray vnto
 the Saints departed to pray for vs, because the better that the men be that
 pray for vs, the more vvorthe are their prayers, according to that of S.
 James: *The continual prayer of a iust man availeth much.* And the examples of *Luc. cap. 5*
 Abraham, Moyses, Iob, Elias, and such like excellent men, doe con- *vers. 17.*
 firme the same, vvhose prayers God did heare when he refused to heare
 others: Yea, God himselfe (as the Scripture teacheth) aduised Abimelech *Gen. 20.*
 King of Egypt, to speake vnto Abraham to pray for him: and would not heare *vers. 7.*
 Iobs friends praying for themselves, but sent them to his seruant Iob, to re- *Iob 42.*
 quest him to pray for them; at whose intercession he did pardon them. Doth *vers. 2.*
 not this most plainly proue, that notwithstanding Gods readinesse to
 receiue vs into his grace, yet his will and pleasure is, that vve doe pray
 vnto others to be a meanes vnto him for vs, especially when we haue so
 offended him, that vve may iustly be ashamed euen to present our selues
 before his diuine Majestie: neede we any better warrant for praying vnto
 others, then the aduise and commandment of God himselfe? Now to the
 confirmation of the consequent: But the Saints, yea the best in the King- *Matt. 11.*
 dome of heauen is greater then S. Iohn Baptist (that is) then the best on earth; *vers. 11.*
 ergo, their prayers will doe vs much more good, then any mans prayer
 yet liuing.

M. PERKINS answereth that we haue a commandment to pray vnto the
 liuing, but none to pray vnto Saints departed.

Reply. I haue already confuted this answer, vvhich I shewed before
 that we neede no commandment to pray, or to desire others to pray for
 vs, but it is sufficient to knowe their credit with God, and willingness to
 intercede for vs when they be thereunto requested.

Wherefore saith M. PERKINS, secondly there is a great difference be-

sworne requesting one to pray for vs. and by inuocation to request them that are absent: for this is a worship that is giuen to them, and a power to heare and helpe all that call vpon them.

Reply. First, that by inuocation we may pray vnto men *S. Augustine* teacheth directly, grounding himselfe vpon the expresse text of Scri-

pture, where *Isaiah* commandeth that his name and the name of his fore-fathers be inuocated vpon of the children of *Israel*. And vvhich is inuocation in English but the calling vpon one, vvhich is as lawfull as the praying vnto him? That we doeth man honour and worship thereby, I grant; and say that

the Saints being better then the liuing, are better worthy of that worship then the liuing. Further, that we assigne them a power to heare them that be absent more then the liuing can doe, it is no maruaile, for the perfection of their heavenly state requireth that prerogative, as I haue more then once declared. But because this point of their knowledge breedeth the greatest doubt of praying vnto the Saints, let *S. Augustine* (a most iudicious Doctor, and one that was not partall in that matter, deliuering his sentence grounded also vpon holy Scripture) be hearkened vnto and followed: he treating of the happynesse of Saints in heauen, hath these

words. If the Prophet *Helizeus* being absent in body, did see his seruant

Lib. 22. de ciuit. 29. Giesly receiving the gift which *Naaman* the Syrian gave him, &c. how much more in that spiritual body shall Saints see all thinges, not only if they shew their eyes, but also from whence they be in body absent: this he confirmeth by that

1. Cor. 13. sentence of the Apostle, We knowe in part, and in part doe we prophesie, but when that shall come which is perfect, then shall that be made void which is

ver. 9. 10. in part, &c. Hence thus reasoneth *S. Augustine*: If the knowledge of this life in such as the Prophets and Apostles were, he no more in comparison of the Saints knowledge in beauen, than is a little childe compared to a man, and this which is in part to that which is perfect: then surely if *Helizeus* and other Prophets did see thinges done farre distant from them, yea thinges that were to be done many hundred yeeres after their times; they being (without doubt) indued with this admirable knowledge from God; how much abundantly shall all they in beauen enjoy this gift, when their bodies shall not binder them, yea they shall not need bodily eyes to see thinges absent, but with the hart or spirit they shall be present to

4. Reg. 5. them, as *Helizeus* was, who said: was not my hart present, when the man returned from his chariot to moete mee? Can any thing be more euident or more

ver. 26. soundly proved, then that the Saints in heauen haue great preheminence aboue all that liued vpon the earth, to see and knowe thinges absent and farre distant from them? which the same father proueth also by most euident experience, in the fiftenth and sixteenth Chapters of his booke intituled *de cura pro mortuis agenda*. And that you may perceiue, that that is

not the opinion of *S. Augustine* alone, I will joynethe testimonies of three
or foure other Fathers with him. *S. Cyrill* Patriarke of Hierusalem saith;
Euen as *S. Peter* did iust with *Ananias*, willing him to sell whether he had sold his *Catich. 16*
ground for so much: so did the Prophet *Helizeus* (though he were not ignorant of *Act. 5.*
it) aske his seruant *Giely*, whether he had not receiued money of *Naaman* the
Syrian; for (saith he) nothing done euen in the darke, is hidden from the Saints:
S. Basil writeth thus: Let a Virgin first of all feare her owne conscience; and if *L. de Vir-*
shee be neuer so solitary, yet hath shee her Angell guardian present; whose sight ginitate.
shee must not contemne, specially when as they haue Angels (as it were) pattern
of virginity: but before all Angels, let her respect and reuerence her spouse *Christ*,
who is present euery where. And why did I speake of an Angell? for shee hath an
innumerable company of Angels present; and wil beuise the holy spirits or soules of
the Fathers: for there is none of these, who doth not see all thinges euery where;
not truly beholding them with corporall eyes, but by a spirituall sight piercing vnto
the knowledge of all thinges. The same doth *S. Iheronimus* that famous an-
cient Doctor resolve in his 32. question. See *S. Augustine* also lib. 20. of *Quest. 32.*
the City of God, the 22. Chapter Teaching that the Saints in heauen, doe
knowe in particular what is done among the damned in hell. And *S. Hierome* doth
proue against *Vigilantius*, that the Saints (who followe the Lamb whither soe-
uer he goeth) be excluded from no place: and from thence that dreaming *He-*
renike for imagining, that vntill the soules of the departed shall be brought aboue
their shrines; they could not heare their prayers that went thither to pray; affir-
ming him therefore to be a monster worthy to be banished into the uttermost wast
of the earth. Encherines a most holy and learned Arch-bishop of *Lyons*, all
most 1200. yeares since confirmeth the same, grounding his discourse vpon
the same textes of Scripture that *S. Augustine* did; saying: If the Prophet
Helizeus absent in body, did see his seruant *Giely* taking gift; how much more
shall Saints in that spirituall body see all thinges, not only if they shew their eyes,
but also from whence they are in body absent. For then shall be that perfection of
which the Apostle speaketh; in part we knowe, and in part doe we prophesie; but
when that shall come which is perfect, it shall be vnto that which is in part: where-
fore when that shall come which is perfect, and this corruptible body shall no longer
cumber the soule, but it shall haue a glorious body which shall nothing hinder it;
shall the Saints then neede the helpe of bodily eyes, to see such thinges which
Helizeus absent needed not to behold his seruant? The testimonies of so
many worthy Fathers will (I hope) suffice to perswade any reasonable
man, that the Saints in heauen doe very well heare our prayers.

To these I will joine that which *M. PER.* maketh our second objecti-
on; because it doth forsake the same. *Abraham* (not then in possession of *Lac. 16.*
heauenly knowledge as our doctrine, but in heauen as the *Prophants* vers. 24.
thinke)

chinke) did heare *Dives* from hell, vvhich is further off from heauen then the face of the earth which we inhabite; and therefore more easily might he haue heard any liuing body praying vnto him, then he did shat rich glutton out of hell.

M. PERKINS answereth, *Thus this is a parable, and out of a parable nothing can be gathered, but that which is agreeable vnto the intent thereof.*

Reply. Why doth he then twice in this very question gather out of it, first, that *Abraham* was in heauen; then, that faith is not to be confirmed by apparitions of dead men, vvhich are not the principall intent and scope of it; but we must giue our newe Masters leaue, both to affirme a thing when it seemeth to make for them; and after to denie the same flatly when it beareth against them. We then say with *S. Ambrose* vpon that place, vvith *S. Hierome*, vvith *S. Augustine*, and vvith *S. Gregory*, (the foure principall Doctors of the Latin Church) that the story of *Dives* and *Lazarus* is a true hystorickall narration, and not a parable of that which neuer was, as by the proper names of *Abraham* and *Lazarus*, and other circumstances they gather. And vvhereas M. Perkins objecteth against it, *That then it may be collected out of it, that wicked men in hell haue compassion and loue to their bretheren on earth, and zeale to Gods glory; because Dives seemeth so to haue had.* I answer, that there is no appearance of any zeale of Gods glory in *Dives*, only he desired that some might goe out of that place of torment to aduertise his bretheren of it; that they came not to him thither: which was not out of any loue neither that he bare to his bretheren; but for feare of his owne further torment if they came thither after him; because he had giuen them euill example and encouragement to doe euill, and perhaps euill counsaile vvhen he liued vvith them, and therefore was by their condemnation to receive in reast of his owne paynes: so that his intreaty for them proceeded only out of the loue of himselfe, and from the feare of more grievous torments. Nowe it being certayne, that *Abraham* in heauen (according to the *Popes* assumption) could heare *Dives* in hell: much more easily can the Saines in heauen heare our prayers, or any mans that dwelleth on earth. Nowe after our doctrine, who hold *Abraham* then to haue bene in *Limbo*, thus the argument must be framed: If *Abraham* not yet indued vvith that perfect knowledge, which the Saines in heauen haue could (nether himselfe) heare *Dives* in hell; betwene whome and himselfe there was *magnum Chorus*, as the text hath; a huge deepe darkenesse and great distance: vvith much facility can the Saines (who excell him being then in *Limbo* in knowledge) see and heare ment liuing on the earth.

Ibid. 26.

Our fifth argument: the Saines in heauen doe present vnto God the prayers of holy men liuing vpon the earth; therefore they knowe the same prayers

prayers well in particular, and embrace and recommend them to the diuine Majestie. The consequent is manifest, because no man can offer vp by word of mouth a petition if he knowe not what it is: neither will any vvise man (such as the Saints be) speake for he knoweth not whome nor what: wherefore if the Saints doe present our prayers to God, they doe knowe them in particular. The antecedent is set downe in expresse tearmes in the word of God: *The 24. Seniors (who saie about the throne of Apoc. 5. God) fell before the Lambe, hauing euery one harpes and golden vials full of odours, vers. 8. which are the prayers of Saints.* M. P. E. saith, that these were their owne prayers and not other mens, but vvithout alleading either authority or reason. We proue by the text it selfe that it must be vnderstoode of other mens prayers and not their owne; because other wise in due construction it should haue bene said, *Which are their owne prayers*; but the text saying, *That the odour of their vials were the prayers of Saints*, it distinguisheth plainly those Saints from themselves, vvich also the learned interpreters on that place, *Primafust*, and the *Greeke schools*, with *Oronimus* do shew confirme and reftifie.

The former arguments were to proue, that the Saints doe heare our prayers; now the next reason shall be to meete with that out-cry of our aduersaries, that (forsooth) we robbe God of his honour, and giue it to Saints, when we pray vnto them, thus: God is more honoured by our worshipping and praying vnto Saints departed; then if we did no worship vnto them, nor praye not vnto them at all, but went immediately to God without their helpe: therefore if it were for nothing else but for the greater honor of God, we ought to worship Saints and to pray vnto them. I proue the former proposition thus: First we worship the Saints, only for the supernaturall gifts vvich God hath bestowed vpon them, which must needs redound vnto the honour of the giuer, as when I honour any of the kings officers, it being principally because he is the kings officer, the King himselfe is together and more principally honored, and Christ saith expressely, *that hee that despiseth one of his seruants, despiseth Iac. 10. Christ himselfe.* Whence it followeth, that he who respecteth and honou-
vers. 16.
 reth one of his seruants (especially because he is his seruant) doth together and (in deed) more principally honour Christ: hee and his graces being the very cause why we respect and vvorshippe the other. Further, vvhen many (and those of the vvorthiest sort) doe become humble suitors vnto God for any one of vs, much more honour is done vnto God through the dignity of their persons, then if one meane silly sinner did sue to him alone: For it is more honourable and magnificall, to doe a pleasure at the instance and request of many vvorthy personages, then

where one poore worrme alone doth sue for it; yea and much more excellent thanks is rendred vnto God by the number and dignity of the suitors, when their petition is graunted them. This argument which is euident in reason, is grounded also vpon *S. Pauls* authority; who requesteth the Christians of *Corinth* to helpe him in their prayers: *That* (saith he) *by many meere persons, I thankes for the gift which is in vs; may be giuen by many in our behalfe.* Seeking then, that by our praying vnto the Saints, they are drawne in to become suitors vwith vs, and for vs; and consequently obtayning their suite, they stand aswell bound to render thanks to God therefore as we doe. It followeth thereupon most euidently, that God is by our praying to his Saints, both more honored when such worthy persons sue vnto him for vs, and also better thanked, for that we doe obtaine by their intercession. Now let vs close vp this question with the testimony of some of the most ancient, famous, and best learned Doctors of both the *Greeke* and *Latine* Church. *Origen* who liued not much about 200. yeares after Christ, prayeth vnto that blessed paterne of patience *Iob*, thus: *O happy Iob now lining for euer with God, and remitting a conquerour in the sight of our Lord and King, pray for vs wretches; that the wonderfull mercy of God may also defend vs in all tribulations; and deliver vs from all oppressions of the wicked one; &c.* *Athanasius* Patriarke of *Alexandria*, and first of the foure principall Doctors of the *Greeke* Church, after many prayes of the immaculate *Virgini Mary*, saith: *Therefore all the rich men of the earth doe pray vnto thee, to be enriched with thy goodes and spirituall contemplations. We do cry vnto thee, remember vs most sacred Virgin, &c.* *Gregory Nazianzen* the second of these famous Doctors, doth thus pray vnto *S. Athanasius*, who dyed in his tyme: *O Athanasius, O sacred and lasting hart, &c. thou from above looke fauourably vpon vs; and governe this holy people that adore the holy Trinity, and cherish and feede vs in peace, &c.* The like prayer he maketh to *S. Cyprian*, and to *S. Basil* in his funerall orations made of them. *S. Basil* speaking of fourty Martirs, of whome he made his sermon, saith: *He that is troubled syneth vnto these forty; and he that rejoyseth runneth vnto them; they that they may be deliuered from their aduersity; these that they may continue in prosperity: here the Godly woman is found praying for her children, &c.* *S. Chrysostome* the last but not the least of the foure, highly commendeth the Emperour of *Rome*, for praying vnto *S. Peter* and *S. Paul*, saying: *Hom. 66.* *He that is reuisted in purple, goeth to embrace their tombes, and all state laid aside doth become an humble suppliant to the Saints, that they would pray vnto God for him: he that goeth crowned with a Diademe and imperiall crowne, humbly prayeth to the fisher-man and to the maker of tents, as to his patrones and protectors.* Let vs to make vp the halfe dozen joyne one other their equall vwith the former;

former; it shall be Gregory Nyssene S. Basils brother, he speaking vnto the
 Martir Theodore, saith: Make intercession vnto the King of all for our Country, Orat. in
 we stand in dread of great persecution. The wicked Scythians are at hand, and Theodor.
 about to wage battle against vs; thou as a souldier fight for vs, as a Martir speake
 boldly in our cause: and much more to this purpose, which I omit that I be
 not ouer tedious. To those of the Greeke Church let vs joyne as many of
 the Doctors of the Latin Church, beginning with S. Ambrose the first of
 the foure more famous Doctors: he first teacheth, That Angels and Mar- Lib. de vi-
 tirs are to be besought vnto, and earnestly prayed vnto by vs, alludging that they dnis.
 are our Presidents, and the beholders of our life and actions; and encourageth vs
 not to be ashamed to vse them as intercessors of our infirmity. And in another
 place prayeth thus: That this my prayer may be of greater force, I request the Serm. 91.
 aide of the blessed Virgin Mary, of the Apostles, Martirs, and Confessors; the de inuent.
 prayers of such personages thou (O Lord) dost neuer despise, if it shall please corpor.
 thee to inspire them to pray for me. S. Augustine also first teacheth vs to pray Gernas. &
 to Martirs, saying: We doe not so remember Martirs at that table, as we doe v-
 thers that rest in peace: for we doe not pray for them, but rather pray to them that
 they will pray for vs. And else where he saith: That it is an injury to pray for in Iohan.
 a Martir, vnto whose prayers we ought to recommend our selves. Secondly, he b Serm. 7.
 himselfe prayeth vnto S. Cyprian to helpe him with his good prayers. Third- de verbia
 ly, he hath recorded the miraculous helpe which two severall persons obtained Apostoli.
 by praying vnto the Martir S. Stephen. S. Hierome is so formall for vvor- c De bapt.
 shipping of Reliques and praying to Saints, in his treatise against Vigilant. cōi. Donat
 ism, that the Protestants are driuent to preferre that odious Heresie before lib. 7. ca. 1.
 him; Yet because some of them denie him to speake there of praying to d Lib. 22.
 Saints, note these wordes of his: Thou Vigilantius sayest, that while we de cinirar.
 liue we may pray one for another, but after we be dead no more prayer shall profit Del cap. 8.
 other. We lesen the objection of the Protestant. Nowe heare that learned
 Doctors answer: If (saith he) Apostles and Martirs while they liue here
 might pray for others, when they ought to be careful for themselves, howe much
 more vnto after their praynes and triumphes. Take also another place of his,
 which is so cleare that it cannot admit any exception: Farewell (saith he Epist. ad
 to that blessed widowe Paula, being then departed this life) and with thy Eustochiū
 prayers helpe the old age of him that worshippeth thee: thy faith and good workes in epitaph.
 haue joynd thee to Christ: being present thou shalt more easily obtayne that which Paula.
 thou wilt aske. The fourth of Latin Doctors is Gregory the great (to whome
 we English-men are so much bound for our conuersion to the Christian
 faith;) he perfwadeth praying to Saints in this sort: If any of vs had a great Homil. 31
 easa to be heard to morrow before a high iudges, we would this day most diligent- super. e-
 ly seek out a wise well spoken and gracious counsaillor, that were likelyst to uō. 7. fne.

handle it in the best manner. Behold (saith he) the seuerie judge Iesus, assisted with a terrible troupe of Angels and Archangels, is to sit vpon vs; before that majesticall assembly the cause of our saluation is to be discussed; and yet we doe not now provide vs Patrones, that may in that day defend vs: Martirs will then be good aduocates, but they looke to be requested; and (as I may say) doe seeke that they may be sought vnto; therefore seeke by praying vnto them to gette them to be your Patrones, make them before hand intercessors of your guiltynesse, because be that is to be our iudge will be no vntreated; that then he may not punish vs. To these foure pillars of the Latin Church, I will (to make the number equall with the Greeke Fathers) add two others; the first shall be out of *Raffinus* (vvhho vvvas of *S. Hieromes* standing) of the most Christian Emperour *Raffin. li. Theodosius*: He asisted with the Priestes and People, visited the holy places, a byssyrian and chad in bayre that he lay prostrate before the shrines of the Apostles and Ad-
 33. uocates, and by his faithfull intercession and praying to the Saints, most humbly sued for succour. The last shall be our famous country-man venerable *Brader Lib. 4. in* Let vs (saith he) with swift surge, seeke vnto the boler of the wall; that is: let vs
Can. ch. the see vnto the often intercession of Angels and Saints, that they may pray for vs vnto our mercifull creator; for these are the most strong and surest fortress of holy Church. Nowe I vvould gladly knowe vvwhether the testimony of these dozen of the chiefest Bishops and Doctors; as well for their Godlynesse of life; as for their knowledge in holy Scriptures, who were also chosen by the holy Ghost to gouerne, instruct, and teach the principal Churches in both *Europe, Affrike, and Asia*; and that in or about the most flourishing state thereof (for all of them tining *S. Gregory* the great and venerable *Pope*, lined within 100. and some within 200. yeares of Christ): Whither, I say, these most sound testimonies of so many sacred and worthy personages, be not sufficient to perswade any reasonable man, that praying to the Saints in heauen is both agreeable to Gods vvord (which no man in these dayes vnderstandeth halfe so well as the worst of any of them did) and also very profitable for vs. Yet for the further assurance of this important matter, I will adde one miracle (which I touched before) wrought in confirmation of it: so that he that will not beleue this, shall be convinced not to beleue God himselfe witnessing of it. In the coasts of *Telousa* in *France*, about 400. yeares past, one *Henry* an Apostata and wicked fellowe, begainne to cry out against praying for the dead, and praying to Saints, and pilgrimages, and some other points of the Catholike doctrine: the fame of *S. Bernards* holynesse and learning being then very great, he was sent for by the *Pope* Legate to come thither, to stay the people from following that lewde companion, who on a day after he had preached at a towne called *Sarlat*, blessed some loaves of bread, and said: *This shall be*
 a certayne

a certayne prooffe that our doctrine is true, and theirs false; if those that be sicke, by tasting of this holy bread be cured of their distases. There stood by among others the Bishop of Charters, who fearing what might followe, added, if they taste of it with faith: Nay said the holy Father Barnard, (nothing doubting of Gods power) I say not so, but he that shall taste of it shall be truly cured, that they may know vs to be true men, and the true messengers of God, then a great multitude tasting of it, were (according to his word) perfectly healed of what disease soeuer they had. What can be more euident or better assured, then that praying to Saints is the truth of God? seing that it pleased God to confirme it in such sort, by the miraculous curing of so many people.

M. PERKINS for an vpsbot faith, that be finally dissenteth from the Catholikes, because they are not content to pray to Saints, but say further, that God through their merits in heauen, doth bestowe many benefites vpon vs on earth.

I would be agreed with vs in the two former points, we should quickly be at accord in this: for the good man is fouly mistaken if he thinke that we affirme the Saints (after they be come to heauen) to merit a newe there; for we hold that none after their death can merit any more, but doethen receiue according vnto their former merits, either saluation or damnation: but we neuerthelesse say, that God in respect of their former merits gotten in this life, doth for their sakes bestowe many benefites vpon vs, and this doth M. PERKINS himselfe confirme in plaine wordes; when he graunteth (pressed thereto by the euidence of Gods word) that men vpon earth haue helpe and benefite, by the faith and piety which the Saints departed shewed when they were in this life: for (saith he further) God shewed mercy on them that keepe his commandements, to a thousand generations. True it is, that this their faith and piety he would not haue to be called merits, but we with that most honourable Father S. Ambrose doe say: *Aud Deum, seruus & interueniens meritorum, & sub habet impetrandi*; with God, a seruant of his hath both the merit to be an intercessour, and the right to obtayne his suite: see more of merits in that question. Here M. PERKINS addeth against himselfe: That the Saints in heauen haue receiued the full reward of all their merits; and therefore there is nothing further that they can merit. Here we haue first that the Saints had merits, which he was wont to deny flatly; against, howe doth God (hauing fully rewarded their former faith and piety at their entrance into heauen) afterward for their sakes, shew mercy to thousands? which he confesseth himselfe: wherefore he is as well bound to answer this as we are, it bearing as strongly against his owne doctrine as it doth against ours. To saue him a labour I answere in a word, that it is one part of the reward of a faithful seruant, to be alwayes after (not deseruing the contrary) in his Masters fauour, and so gracious with him, that he may

In this
question.]

Lib. 5. su-
per Lucā.

intreate any reasonable matter at his handes : so are the Saints vvith God; vvho can neuer be wearyed vvith their suites, so long as they all doe but tend vnto his owne honour, and the saluation of his poore creatures, and as we both agreed vpon before: *Their faith, piety, and charity*. vvholes they liued, did and doeb still moue and cause God to shewe mercy vnto thousands vpon earth, for their sakes; though their merits were before most abundantly rewarded : let this suffice for this question.

OF IMPLICITE OR INFOLDED FAITH.

M. PERKINS Page 266.

THis question is handled for two causes (as he saith pag. 274.) first, to rectifie the conscience of the weaker sort of his disciples; secondly, to rectifie their Catechismes which doe (as he censurcth) require too full an assurance of saluation in all men.

It being then for the instruction of his ovne deceived flocke, and not much appertayning to vs, I will positt ouer lightly.

He teacheth a twofold implicite of faith: first, that faithfull men may be ignorant at the beginning of many articles of faith, and learne them after vvayes.

It was so (in deece) in Christes time, because he taught them not all at once; but since the establishment of the Gospell, it is necessary that euery one beleue all the articles of the Apostles Creede, the true doctrine of the Sacraments, and such other necessary heades of the Christian religion: other points of faith may be learned in time, according vnto the capacity of the persons.

The second fold of his faith is; that many (of his deceived disciples) haue not at their conuersion, and in time of temptation, a full assurance of their saluation; which notwithstanding will serue the turne then, if they desire to haue a full assurance, and labour afterward to attayne vnto it: which he speaketh to the comfort of their consciences, that cannot persuade themselues so assuredly, that their sinnes are pardoned them.

This presumptuous doctrine of full assurance of saluation, I haue in a seueral question before confuted; therefore I say only here, that no Christian is bound to haue any such absolute assurance of his owne saluation, *Ad Philip. 2. vers. 12.* but that he must (according to the Apostles rule) *work his saluation with trembling and feare*, considering his owne frailty: Marry, very good hope and confidence ought we all to haue, in respect of Gods infinite mercy and goodnesse, and in the inestimable merits of our Lord and Saviour

IN vs. Christ; but by faith we cannot beleue it, vnlesse God doe extraordinary liereueale any such thing vnto vs: which he doth to very fewe of his best beloued, and best tryed seruants.

In the matter of our difference, he saith first, *That we teach not faith to be a knowledge of things beleueed; but a reuerent assent vnto them, whether they be knowne or vnkowne.*

But this he saith very vnruly: for we hold faith in his owne nature, to comprehend a certayne kinde of knowledge, though not so cleare and euident; yet of as great assurance, as is the knowledge of naturall things: but the man harpeth vpon something else, if he could hitte on it. We say (indeede) that it is not of necessity, for the simpler sort and ignorant people, to reade the holy Scriptures, and to goe fish their faith out of that profound Ocean; but may content themselves with their Pastors instructions, and with their Catechismes and other bookes of piety and deuotion: albeit, we wish them of better vnderstanding (if they be not too curious and wilfull) to reade the holy Scriptures vvith reuerence, seeking humbly to better their knowledge, and especially to amend their liues, and in places of difficulty, not to trust vnto their owne wits, but to referre themselves to the exposition of the *Catholike Church, which is the pillar and fortresse of truth*; and there vpon vvholly to rely. Yet, vve require much more knowledge in the simpler sort of people, then the *Protestants* doe: for we teach, that euery one is to knowe expressly the 12. articles of the *Apostles Creed*, the tenne *Commandments*, and those *Sacraments* which they themselves are to receiue. Further also, all such lawes and ordinances of either the spirituall, or temporall *Gouernour*, which doe appertayne vnto their owne estate; that they may knowe howe, both in spirituall and temporall matters, to carry themselves vvithout offence. Let those our Authors which teach cases of conscience, be consulted in those points, and you shall finde them to charge euery man in conscience, to knowe all these things, whatsoeuer some men haue thought to the contrary; who be not in that allowed, but disproued euen by the testimony of that Authour *Baues* vvhome M. PERKINS quoteth.

And touching praying in *Latin*, the lawes of the *Catholike Church* doth not bind any man to pray in *Latin*, who is not first bound to learne the *Latin* tongue, that is: men in holy orders are bound to their *Latin* Breviary; but no man ignorant of the *Latin* tongue, must be admitted vnto holy orders: for them that are ignorant of the *Latin* tongue, vve haue diuers bookes of *English* prayers, vvherein they may exercise themselves fruitfully. If any deuout women, or others who vnderstand not *Latin*, desire to reade some selected and approued *Latin* prayers, we doe not forbidde them;

them; because those prayers haue many priuiledges aboue others. And we doubt not, but that many of them doe reade the same *Latin* prayers, with much more humility, attention, and eleuation of their mindes vnto God and all goodnesse; then thousandes of *Protestants* or *Puritans*, who reade and pronounce gallantly many glorious *English* prayers composed very curiously, when their harts be farre from God.

Lastly, he dissenteth from vs, for that we say; *That some articles of faith, were at the first beleened generally by an insulded faith, which afterward being by generall Councils vnfolded, and declared to be articles of faith, were beleened expressly.*

This implicite of faith touching articles of religion, *M. PER.* reiecteth, saying; *That all matters of faith are contained plainlie in the Scriptures.* This he saith without probation, and it is by me in the question of Traditions refuted already: therefore, to that place I referre the reader.

OF PURGATORY

OF OUR CONSENT.

M. PERKINS Page 278.

WE hold a *Christian Purgatory*, by which we vnderstand, first, the afflictions of Gods children here on earth: secondly, the blend of *Christ* is a *Purgatory* for our sinnes; and so *Augustine* calleth the mercy of God our *Purgatory*.

To this I say, that the word *Purgatory* may be taken diuersly, and signifie many thinges; which because they be not to the present purpose, may be here well omitted.

THE DIFFERENCE.

WE differ in two thinges: first, concerning the place, the *Catholikes* hold it to be vnder the ground, into which mens soules after this life doe enter.

This we deny as hauing no warrant in the word, which mentioneth only two places

Luc. 16. for men after this life: heauen and hell.

1. 35. 26. Here *M. PER.* beginneth the disproofe of *Purgatory* with his ordinary hackney, it is not mentioned in the Scriptures. To which I answer first,

Iob. 3. that it is, as shall be proued hereafter: but if it were not, yet were it to be

beleened, because it was received by Tradition euen from the Apostles time.

time. Besides this fault in M. P. A. argument, there is another more childish, to wit: because there is no mention made of Purgatory in three or foure places by him quoted, he concludeth that it hath no warrant at all, in any other place of Scriptures; as who should say, there is no Doctor of Philosophie in two or three Colledges of Cambridge, therefore there is not one in all the Vniuersity besides. Finally, the very first place by him cited, overthroweth flatly his owne position, it being truly vnderstood according vnto the generall exposition of the most learned Doctors: for Abraham then was not in heauen, but in a third place called *Lymbo Patrum*, because, before Christ had paid their ranfome by his death on the crosse, the Fathers of the old Testament were holden captiue: and so of Christ it is said, *That ascending on high, he hadde captiuitie captiue.* And St Paul pro-
ueth by the entering of his high Priest only into the second part of the Tabernacle; vers. 8.
called Sancta Sanctorum; that the way of the Holies was not then manifested, Hebr. 9.
but by the blood of Christ to be laid open, and they by the death of the testators, to receiue the eternall redemption. But this is by the way, to shew the wisdom of the man, to bring one text in controuersie to established another.

But he goeth forward and saith stoutly, that there can be no place for Purgatory: for that it is saide, *That they who dyed in the Lord, are bidde to rest from their labours: which cannot be (saith he) if they go into Purgatory.* *Apoc. 14. vers. 13.*
And is cut off all caule; it is further said, their worker (that is) the reward of their worker, followe them, even at the heeles.

I answer first, that we haue here by the way, heauen to be the reward of workes by M. P. A. confession, which in the question of merits he denied most absolutely. Secondly, that albeit they who die in our Lord, doe not goe to Purgatory, yet many others may; because according vnto St. *Lib. 20. de Augustines* judgement, and the holy bretheren of *Geniua*, this place is to be vnderstood of Martirs only, who die for our Lord. And we that confesse Purgatory, doe hold that no Martir doth goe thither; but being (as it were) a new baptized in their owne blood, doe appeare before the face of God without any spotte: whereas other ordinary good Christians be not free from all such staines, and may also haue much penance at their death not performed, which they must endure in Purgatory. I say thirdly, that if the vvordes should be applyed to all Christians that die in the grace of God; yet is there nothing in them against Purgatory. For the vvordes following may well be spoken of them that goe thither; because they both *rest from their labours*, which they had in their former life: and also enjoy an assurance of heauen, without any such peril or hazard thereof, as they liued in before: and *their worker* may very well be said to *followe them*; for that according vnto the rate of their workes, they must en-

dure the fire of purgatory, either more or lesse. Fourthly, I may answer with *S. Augustine* on that place; that they who die in our Lord, from that time there spoken off, shall goe to heauen: *Amodo dicit spiritus, from thence forth saith the spirit, they shall rest from their labours.* Nowe, to see what time is there spoken off, reade the seauenth verse of the same chapter, where are these wordes: *Fear our Lord, and giue him honour, because the houre of judgement is come: so that from thence forth* (that is) after the last judgement there shall be no Purgatory; vvhwherefore, M. PERKINS very cunningly clipped the word *from thence forth* out of the text, for feare of breeding some scruple: and thus you see, that the text of Scripture so highly esteemed by M. PERKINS serueth nothing for his purpose. Nowe to some fragments which he citeth out of the Fathers.

Han. 50. *Augustine saith well, after this life, there remaineth no compulsion or satisfaction.*
Tom. 10.

This same text he cited before in the question of satisfaction somewhat otherwise, *viz. banil. 5. tom. 10.* both quotations are most imperfect: for in that tenth Tome of *S. Augustine* vvhorkes, there are sixe severall kinde of Homilies, to wit: *De verbis Domini, De verbis Apostoli, 50. baniliarum, de Sanctis, de Tempore, de Diversis*; which of these he meaneth I knowe not: and to reade ouer the 50. and fiftie ofsenory of them for one line I list not; the man belike tooke it by retayle. But it may most easily be answered even by the very next wordes, that he citeth out of the same author: *Here is all remission of finnes; here be temptations that mone vs to sinne; lastly, here is the euill from which we desire to be deliuered, but there is none of all these things.* So that in this life only there is compulsion (that is) true repentance, and turning from all sinne, with satisfaction, or a purpose to satisfie; and he that dyeth without this true repentance, shall be damned: there is no Purgatory for them, but for such only as die with true compulsion, and with full purpose to satisfie for their finnes, either in this life, or in the next.

De verbis M. PERKINS citeth another line, oue of *S. Augustine.* *We be not here*
Apost. 31. *without finnes, but we shall goe hence without sinne.*

Of whome speaketh he trowe you? vvhhat, of all sortes of men? then none shall be damned. Againe, what is this to Purgatory? for they that goe to Purgatory, must before they die, by true repentance obtrayne pardon of their finnes; or else they shall not goe to Purgatory, but to Hell. Lastly, I haue read the Homily ouer, and find no such word there. Heare (by the way) out of the same workes of that most venerable Doctor, three passages for Purgatory; and conferre them with those cited by M. PERKINS, and then judge what his opinion was of Purgatory. In that Treatise called

led 50. Homilies. homil. 16. he writeth thus: *This punishment (of hell fire) carryeth for them, who shall perish euerslastingly; to whom it is said: The chaffe Math. 3. he shall burne with vnquenchable fire. But they who haue done thinges worthy of temporall punishment, of whom the Apostle saith: If any mans vworke 1. Cor. 3. burne he shall suffer detriment, but he shall be saued yet so as through fire, of which also the Prophet speaketh, and a fiery flooddedid runne before him: Dan. 7. They shall passe through a fiery floodde, and horrible fowder of burning flames. And according to the greatnes of the matter of sinne, so shall their stay and abode be there; and as much as their former faultis required, so much shall the reasonable correction of the flame take of the man. Is not this a plaine description of Purgatory? The second out of his Enchyridion: Neyther is it to be denyed, but Cap. 110. that the soules of the departed, are holpen by the piety of their friends aliuely when for them is offered the Sacrifice of our Mediator, or almes are giuen in the Church for them. But these thinges profit them, who when they liued, did deserue that these thinges might profit them: for there is a certayne kinde of life neither so good, that it doth not neede these after their death, neither so euill, but that these thinges will profit him after his death. There is a life so good, that it needeth not these thinges; and againe another so euill, that cannot be holpen with them, &c. The third, out of the third Treatise cited by M. PERKINS de verbis Apostoli: It is not to be doubted, but that men deceased this life, are holpen by the prayers of the holy Church, and by the comfortable Sacrifice, and by almes, which are giuen for their soules; that our Lord doth deale with them more mercifully, then their sinnes required: those men then were in Purgatory. Thus much (by the way) out of S. Augustine, for a taste of his opinion touching Purgatory. Nowe to the rest of M. PERKINS testimonies.*

Cyril saith: They which are once dead, can adde nothing to the thinges that they haue done; but shall remayne as they were left, and waite for the time of the last iudgement. Lib. 3. in Esaiam.

Here is such a citation as sendeth to no peece of his vworkes, yet, nothing difficult to be answered if any such be: for the very next sentence that he alleadgerth will serue to solue it, which is out of S. Chrysostome, who saith: That after the end of this life there be no occasions of merit. To both which the answer is, that a man after his death cannot merit any more, because merit only belongeth vnto men while they liue: after death they may well reape the due reward of their meritis, or else suffer just punishment for their former offences. Neyther can a man that is dead alter his estate, but must expect iudgement according to his former deserts. Now, if he haue vpon the true foundation builded wood, hay, and stubble, then he must passe through the fire: marry, by the helpe of good prayers, almes, and principally by the Sacrifice of the Masse, he may haue his paines

OF PURGATORY.

in that purging fire, remitted or much eased; as you haue heard before
Hom. 41. out of *S. Augustine*. And the same teacheth *S. Chrysostome*, saying: The
in 1. ad dead are holpen not by their frendes weeping; but by their prayers, supplications,
Crusab. and almes. And this is all in effect which *M. PERKIN*s disputeth against
 Purgatory.

Secondly (saith he) we differ from them touching the meanes of Purgatory.
 They say that men are purged by suffering of paines in Purgatory, whereby they
 satisfie for their veniall sinnes; and for the temporall punishment of their mortall
 sinnes: We teach the contrary, holding that nothing can free vs from the least pun-
 ishment of the smallest sinne, but the sufferings of Christ. Indeede they say,
 that our sufferings in themselves considered, doe not purge and satisfie; but as
 they are made meritorious by the suffering of Christ. But to this I oppose one text
Hebr. 1. of Scripture: Christ hath purged our sinnes by himselfe; where the last
vers. 3. clause cuts the throate of all humane satisfactions and merits: and it giueth vs to
 vnderstand, that whatsoeuer purgeth vs from our sinnes, is not to be found in vs,
 but in Christ alone.

To batter this his only fortresse, his owne wordes in the beginning of
 the same Chapter, are very sufficient: for there he plainly teacheth, That
 by afflictions which men suffer in this world, they are cleansed from their corrupti-
 on; as gold is from the drosse by fire. If our owne suffering purge vs from
 sinne (as he confesseth before) howe then can it be true, that that which
 purgeth vs from our sinnes, is not in vs, but in Christ alone? Againe, it is
 but a diuers reading in the Greeke text, that hath those wordes, by himselfe;
 for they are not in the Latin translation. But admitting them for currant,
 the sence is most easie, and nothing against eyther Purgatory or humane
 satisfactions: for the Apostle meaneth no other thing thereby, then that
 he expresseth in the 9. Chapter following, to wit: That Christ not by the
 blood of Calues or Goates, but by his owne blood, purged vs from our sinnes, and
 wrought our redemption; in such sort as in the question of satisfaction hath
 beene declared at large. Here I say briefly, that Christ appeased his Fa-
 thers wrath, towards all such as shal be made partakers of his merits, de-
 faced the sinne it selfe, and paid the eternall punishment due vnto their
 sinnes; but left a temporall paine to be endured of the offendour (for e-
 uery such sinne pardoned) eyther in this world, or in the next: both be-
 cause reason requireth, that he vwho falleth after that he was once freely
 pardoned (as we were all in baptism) should not the second time be so
 easilie admitted into Gods grace, as that he should not himselfe feele some
 smart for his offence. Againe, we being members of Christs body, meete
Rom. 8. it is that we suffer with him, if we will reioyce with him; as the Apostle teach-
Col. 1. 24. eth: vwho also was so bold as to say, that he in his body accomplished those
 things

things, that wanted to the passions of Christ. To this place M. P. R. referreth prayer for the dead, of which he propoundeth three conclusions: two affirmative, and one negative, but proueth nothing.

The first conclusion: *We hold that Christian charity must extend it selfe to them that be dead, to wit: in honest buriall of them, in preserving their good names, and in reliefe of their posterity.*

The second conclusion: *Further we pray in generall for the faithfull departed, that God would hasten their joyfull resurrection.*

The third conclusion: *To pray for particular men departed, and to pray for their deliuerance out of Purgatory, we thinke it vnlawfull; because we haue neither promise: nor commandement so to doe: and so endeth he the question of Purgatory, not propounding one argument in fauour of our party.*

His reason of the necessity of a promise and commandement to pray for any thing, before we pray for it, I haue in the question of praying to Saints confuted at large, and therefore omit it here: and will furnish this place with some arguments for the prooffe of Purgatory. And though M. P. R. blushed not to say, that it hath no warrant in the word of God; yet he hath, or might haue scene in *Cardinall Bellarmine*, little lesse then 20. *Tom. 1. controuer.* textes of holy Scripture, vsed by the ancient Doctors to confirme the doctrine of Purgatory, I will make choise of some fewe of them: and because Purgatory and prayer for the dead, be so closely lincked together, that the one doth necessarily followe the other, I will joyne them both together. And (gentle Reader) remember here that which hath bene before rehearsed out of *S. Augustine*: that there be some who die in so perfect an estate, that they are carryed presently to heauen; as all Innocents, and Martirs, and such other holy personages who commit fewe offences, and yet doe leade a very austere life. *Others* there be too too many, vvhoboth liue and die wickedly; such are also straight after their death, plunged into the flames of hell fire. Nowe, *There is a third sort of men*, who liue reasonable honestly, at least doe die very penitently; these only goeto Purgatory, there to doe satisfaction for their former offences, before they can be admitted into the joyes of heauen: nowe to our proofes.

First, *Iudas Machabæus* (that most valiant Captayne of the people of 2. *Machab. God*) with all his armie, prayed vnto God to pardon the offence of them that were be- *12.* slain: * and afterward making a generall collection among them, sent 12000. * *Verf. 42.* groates to Hierusalem, that sacrifice might there be offered for the offence of the departed: the holy Ghost in the text witnessing it, To be a bold and boldsome cogitation to pray for the dead, that they may be loosed and deliuered from their sinnes. This text is so euident for prayer for the dead, that it can haue no other answer, then that which *Hereticks* flie vnto, in their most desperate plunges,

plunges, to vvrit: to denie the whole booke to be Canonically Scripture. Vpon which point, because it belongeth to another place, I wil not dwell yet, vvill I note by the vvay, that *S. Augustine* in expresse termes doth
 18. Cinit. declare, that the Church of God in his time did take it for Canonically Scripture,
 cap. 36. although the Iewes did not so. The Protestants (I knowe vvell) cavill at many thinges in those bookes, so might they that were disposed to wrangle, against the best Hystories in the Bible. But one of milder temper may (perhaps) demand, howe those bookes that were at the first doubted off by many, and not generally received for Canonically, could afterward be made Canonically: to this I answer, that the Protestants (as vvell as we) doe take nowe for Canonically, some such bookes as were 300. yeares after Christ doubted off, to wit: the Epistle to the Hebrewes, *S. James* Epistle, the second of *S. Peter*, the second and third of *S. Iohn*, *S. Iude*s Epistle, and the Apocalipse, or Revelation of *S. Iohn*. Nowe, they themselves hauing admitted all these of the newe Testament for Canonically, vpon the judgement and declaration of the Catholike Church: vvhy doe they not as vvell take those of the old Testament for Canonically also, the same Church hauing about a thousand yeares past, approued them for Canonically, as well as the other? At the first, because of the great persecutions, the learned could not so generally meete together, to examine & discusse such matters; as afterward in the peace of the Church; and therefore in that time diuers men vvere of diuers opinions, concerning the authority of such bookes: but vvhen the learned in the Church, assembling together in the name of God, and hauing the assistance of the holy Ghost to direct them, had once declared which were Canonically, which not; there was no further question among the obedient children of the Church: onely vnskillfull men, or Heretikes (because they will be choosers) will admit of vvhich it pleaseth them, and reject also those vvhich displease them. But to leaue this digression; the bookes of the *Machabees* cannot but haue euen with Heretikes, farre greater credit, then *Linie*, *Plutarke*, and such like prophane hystories, as *M. PER.* also confelleth. They then vvill serue to conuince any reasonable man, that the custome of the people of *Israhel* (then the only chosen seruants of God) vvast to pray for the dead, and to offer sacrifice for the pardon of the soules that were departed; because it is so recorded in the best hystorie of their times: and is also seconded by *Iosephus* the sonne of *Gordon* in his booke of the Iewes vvarrre; vvhere he saith, that the Iewes were wont to pray for the dead; vnlesse it were for such that had slaine themselves. And thus much out of the old Testament; nowe out of the newe.

Our Sauour Christ willett vs agree vvith our aduersary, vvhiles we are in
 the

the way with him, least perhaps he deliuer vs to the iudge, and the iudge to the officer; and so we be cast into prison: for verily (saith he) thou shalt not goe out thence, till thou repay the last farthing. By this parable or example, our Sauour teacheth vs vvholes we liue in this vvorld, to agree vvith the lawe of God, vvwhich is our aduersary when we transgresse and offend against it; otherwife at our death we shall iustly be cast into prison, and lyethere till we haue fully satisfied and paid the last farthing of our debt. The Protestants say, that he who is so cast into prison shal neuer come out: We say the contrary, that this parable concerneth them especially: that shall be deliuered at the length, and proue it; first because the parable is not taken from a murderer or theefe, vvho may be iustly condemned to death, or to perpetuall prison; but of a debtor, vvho ordinarily doth gette out in time; and therefore it agreeth better vnto men cast in Purgatory, to pay the debt of the former trespasses, then to them that are condemned to hell. Besides, the ancient Fathers doe so expound it.

Origen. *Albeit it be promised, that he shall at length come forth of his prison, In epist. 1. for notwithstanding it is designed, that he cannot goe out vntill he hath paid the last farthing.* ad Rom.

S. Cyprian. *It is one thing to stand for pardon, and another to passe straight to glory: one thing, being cast into prison not to goe forth till you haue paid the last farthing; and another, to receive presently the reward of faith and vertue: one thing, to be corrected and purged long time in fire for your finnes; and another, by dying for Christ to haue purged all your finnes.* Lib. 4. ca. 2.

Eusebius Emislenus. *But they who haue deserved temporall paines (vnto Hamil. 3. whom these wordes of our Lord appertayne, that they shall not goe out thence, de Epiph. vntill they haue paid the last farthing) shall passe through a flood of fire. So that both by the scope of the parable, and by the interpretation of the Fathers, many men dying in debt, that is, not hauing fully satisfied for their former finnes, are cast into the prison of Purgatory, there to pay the last farthing, vnlesse by the piety and intercession of their friends, their more speedy deliuerance be procured and obtrayned.*

Moreover, that there is such pardon graunted after this life to some, is confirmed by that vvwhich our Sauour saith in another place: *That they who sinne against the holy Ghost, shall not be forgiven neither in this vvorld, nor in the vvorld to come:* vvwhich were a very improper kinde of speech, if none were to be pardoned in the vvorld to come; As it should be for our King, to say to some offendour, I will not forgieue thee neither in England, nor in Italy, vvhereas he hath nothing to doe to pardon in a strange Dominion. And the learned knowe, that in enumeration of partes, it is as foule a fault to reckon something for a part which is none, as to omit some true part indeede:

indeede: so that then our Lord parting the forgiveness of sinners into this world, and the world to come, in all congruity of speech we must understand, that some sinners are forgiven in the world to come; which cannot be in heauen, where none are; nor in hell where there is no remission of sinne: therefore it must be in a third place, which we call Purgatory.

And this is no new collection made by moderne Catholics; out of the vvorde of God; but as ancient as *S. Augustine*, who hath these wordes:

Lib. 21. de Some men suffer temporall punishment in this life only: others after their death;
cinis. c. 13. some others both here and there: yet, before that last and most severe judgement. For all men after their deaths, shall not goe into the same punishments of hell for (saith he) citing this place) to some, that which is not forgiven in this world, is forgiven in the world to come, as I haue taught before. With *S. Augustine* and

Lib. 4. de greeth *S. Gregory*, saying: It is to be blessed, that there is a Purgatory first before the judgement, for certayne light faults; for that the truth saith: if any man blaspheme against the holy Ghost, it shall not be forgiven; neither in this world, nor in the world to come. In which sentence there is giuen to vnderstand, that certayne faults are forgiven in this world, and certayne in the world to come: for that which is denied of one, by consequence, is vnderstood to be granted

In 3. Mar. to some others. Euen so doe *S. Bede*, and *S. Bernard* with diuers others, ex-
serm. 66. pound those wordes of our blessed Sauour.

In Cant. The third text of the newe Testament, shall be taken out of *S. Paul* to the *Corinthians*; vvhether he (by a similitude of building) declarerh; that
1. Cor. 3. some men vpon the only sound foundation IESVS Christ, doe build gold, silver, and precious stones, that is, very excellent and perfect workes: others doe build vpon the same foundation, wood, hay, and stubble, that is, imperfect and many vaine trifling workes. He adderh: that the day of our Lord, which shall be revealed in fire, shall proue the workes of the afore-said builders: and they who haue built gold, silver, and precious stones, because their workes will abide the prooffe of fire, shall receive their reward; but because the other sort of builders workes cannot resist the fire, but will burne, they shall suffer detriment, but shall be saved, yet so as by fire.

Hence we gather, that after the triall of Gods judgement, some men who are found guilty of lighter faults, shall be saved, because they keepe the foundation; notwithstanding they shall suffer detriment, and passe through the fire of Purgatory: as a man that hath an halfe-timber house covered with thurch, set on fire; he being in the midst of it, must passe through the flames of fire, to escape and saue his life. The Protestants say, that it is the fire of tribulation in this life that doth try our workes, and that through it only lighter faults are purged. We reply first, that tribulation of this life, doth not commonly discern and try good mens workes from the

the badde; because very often good men are more afflicted in this world then the badde. Againe, it is said in the text, that at the day of our Lord this tryall shall be made; which day of our Lord being expressed vwith the Greeke article (as here it is) ordinarily in Scripture signifieth the day of his judgement; so that by the very circumstances of the text it is very plaine, that the Apostle S. Paul deliuered the doctrine of Purgatory: which yet is made more assured by the vniuersall consent of the holy Fathers, who take this place to proue Purgatory. See Origen, homil. 6. in Exodum. S. Basil saith: He threatneth not viter ruine and destruction, but signifieth In cap. 9. a cleansing according vnto the Apostles sentence; but he shall be sau'd, yet so as Esay. by fire.

Theodorete. This same fire we beleue to be the fire of Purgatory, in which In scolijs the soules of the departed are tryed and purged, as gold is in the furnace. Oecumenius and Anselmus vpon the same place, be of the same judgement. Cor. 3.

S. Ambrose vpon these wordes: Sinners haue drawne their swordes, saith: In psal. 36 though our Lord will saue his, yet so they shall be sau'd as by fire; and albeit they shall not be consumed with fire, yet they shall be burnt. S. Hierome in 4. cap. Amos. S. Augustine in almost twenty places, expoundeth this text after the same manner. Heare this one taken out of his Commentary vpon the 37. Psalme: O Lord reprove me not in thy indignation, that I goe not to hell; neither correct me in thy wrath, but purge me in this life, and make me such a one, that shall haue no neede of that purging fire, prepared for them who shall be sau'd; yet so, as by fire. And why so? but because here they doe build vpon the foundation, wood, hay, and stubble: if they did build gold, siluer; and precious stones, they should be safe from both fires; not only from that euillasting, which is to punish the wicked euillastingly, but from that also, which shall correct them who shall be sau'd by fire: for it is said, he shall be sau'd, yet so as by fire. And because he shall be sau'd, that fire is condemned: yea truly, though they shall be sau'd, yet that fire is more grieuous, then whatsoeuer a man can suffer in this life. These few testimonies of the most approued Doctors, may suffice to assure vs, that the Apostles speeches are to be taken of a purging fire, prepared after this life for them, that vpon their true faith in Christ doe build (through the frailty of our nature) many idle, odde, and vaine workes.

The last text of holy Scripture shall be this, taken out of S. Iohn: He 1. Epist. 5. that knoweth his brother to sinne a sinne not vnto death, let him aske, and life shall ver. 16. be giuen him: there is a sinne to death, for that I say not that any man aske. Hence I reason thus: a sinne to death, must in this place needs be taken for sinne, wherein a man dyeth; for which no man can pray, because that he vwho dyeth in deadly sinne, shall neuer afterward be pardoned: wherefore, a sinne not vnto death, is a sinne of vvhich a man repenteth him before his

death; and for such a one doth *S. Iohn* exhort vs to pray: therefore, the prayer which he speaketh of when he biddeth vs not pray, being prayer for the dead; the other prayer also, must be prayer for the departed; and so doth he will vs to pray for such men departed, that dyed not in deadly sinne, but with repentance. The *Caluinists* say, That *S. Iohn* speaketh rather of Apostatacs, and some such like baynous offenders, for whome yet aliue he would not haue vs to pray. But this is very vicked doctrine; for vve may pray euen for *Turkes*, and *Iewes*, and the most sinnefull persons that liue, whiles they liue and haue time to repent: for vvhath knowe vve, whether Goddy will take them to mercy or no? and *S. Paul* saith expressly, that he would haue vs to pray for all persons, whiles they liue. Much more conuenient therefore is that exposition before rehearsed, which is taken out of *S. Augustine*, who affirmeth: That a sinne to death, is to leaue faith working by charity, euen till death.

To these arguments selected out of holy Scripture, I will ioyne another of no smaller moment with vs *Carbolikes*, which is drawne from Apostolical tradition, and the practise of the vniuersall Church in her primitive purity, which hath vsed alwayes to pray for the dead. Let vs heare two or three substantiall vvitnesse speake in this matter. *S. Chrysostome* that most renowned Patriarke of *Constantinople* shall be the first, vvhom *Hon. 69.* saith: That it was not without good cause ordeyned and decreed by the Apostles, ad populu. that in the dreadfull mysteries there be made a commemoration of the dead. For they did knowe, that they should receiue thereby great praise and much commodity.

S. Augustine as famous for his learning and sincerity in the *Latin Church*, as the other was in the *Greeke*, saith to this point thus: It is not to be doubted, De verbis Apostoli. but that the dead are holpen by the prayers of holy Church, and by the comfortable sacrifice, and by the almes that are giuen for their soules, that God may deale more mercifully with them, then their sinnes deserued. For (saith he) the vniuersall Church obserueth and keepeth this, as by tradition receiued from the Fathers, that for them who are departed in the communion of the body and blood of Christ, when at the sacrifice there is made a commemoration or mention of them, they are prayed for; and the sacrifice is remembred to be offered for them. The third witnesse is

Tertullian a most auncient and learned authour: who reckoneth it among the traditions of the Apostles, to pray for the soules of the faithfull departed. It appearing then so manifest, by the testimony of such approued witnesses, that to pray for the dead is an Apostolical tradition, generally receiued and practised in the most flourishing state of the Church; *S. Augustine* verdict must needs proue true, who saith: that it is a point of most insolent madness, to dispute against that, which the whole Church doth practise. Wherefore, our Protestants vvere 1300. yeares agoe, condemned for Heretikes in this point

point in one *Erius*, vvho vvvas censured by that holy and learned Bishop Epiphanius, *heres.* 75. and by *S. Augustine ad Quodvultdesum*, *heres.* 53. an *Heretike*; because *that to the Arrian heresie he added this of his owne, that we must not offer sacrifice nor pray for the soules of the departed: so that to denie prayer for the dead, is by the judgement of the auncient Church, deemed flat heresie.*

To these former authorities, let vs adde one reason deducted also out of the vvord of God. *When a sinner is truly converted, though the fault and eternall paine due to it, be through Chrestes merits freely pardoned him; yet, there remaineth some temporall punishment to be suffered by the party himselfe, for the same offence before remitted.* This proposition is denied by the Protestants; but it is so manifestly set downe in Gods vvord, that they cannot but be put to great shame for it, if they be vvrged with the examples of the children of *Israell*, of *Aaron*, and *Moyse*, and *David*; who were all first pardoned of their sinnes, and afterward put to penance for the very same offences, as I haue in the matter of satisfaction more amply proued. Nowe to the present purpose: *But many who haue bene great offenders, are not contented till towardes their death; or else being converted long before, doe not fulfill such penance, as in iustice is due vnto their grieuous and manifold former offences:* therefore, the due order of Gods iustice requireth, that after their death they accomplish that which was wanting in their life time. To this nothing else can be answered, but that which some of them doe answer: that the very death vvwhich euery one endureth, doth serue to supply all former defects of his life, and purgeth him cleane from all payne due to his former sinnes: but this is said both without authority, or any reason. For a naturall death is due vnto all the Sonnes of *Adam*, for original sinne; in so much as the very innocents baptised are not freed from it: and therefore, that cannot be also a satisfaction for all other actual sinnes. Again, some vvho haue deserved great punishment, die suddainely, and vvith small payne: so that there is no proportion betweene the payne of their death, and their former trespasses. *Ave* denie not, but that such may be both the length and sharpenesse of the sicknesse whereof some die; that it being patiently taken may either greatly diminish; or (perhaps) wholly extinguish all former offences: but to say that euery ones ordinary death, doth cancell all former obligation of sinnes, howe many or howe great soeuer they were, hath neither rime or reason in it.

I could for a conclusion assemble the sentences of the fathers, and shew howe they prayed for the soules departed in their funerall Orations for them: as *Gregory Nazianzene*, for the soule of *Cesani*; *S. Ambrose* for the soules of *Theodosius*, *Valentinian*, and *Satyrus*, promising also to offer sa-

In *epist.* crifice for them; S. Hierome commendeth Pomachius for praying and giuing
ad eund. almes for the soule of his wife; and Theodoret praying the Emperour Theo-
Lib. 5. by dosius the younger for prostrating himselfe at the Reliques of S. Iohn Chry-
stos. c. 26. sostome, and praying there for the soules of his parents, Arcadius and Eudoxia.
Lib. 3. In I could (I say) bring a clowde of witnesss to this purpose, but *Caluin* ca-
stitut. c. 5. tech me of that labour; who acknowledgeth, *That* for 1300. yeares before
J. 10. his dayes (that is almost, from the first time that the auncient Fathers be-
 ganne to write) the custome of praying for the dead hath bene vsed in the
 Church: Marry, he would haue vs belecue, that it was brought in by the
 vulgar sort, after the imitation of the Gentile. But we haue shewed, that
 the best learned and most sincere and Godly Preachers and Doctors,
 haue both out of the word of God, and Tradition of the Apostles taught
 their flockes that point of Christian doctrine; and further, by name con-
 demned them of heresie, that taught the contrary: so that very fondly
 doth *Caluin* taxe S. *Augustine* for praying for his mothers soule, saying
 (forsooth) that he did it only to satisfie the old womans request; and saith
 yet more impudently, that in his booke of the care to be taken for the
 dead, he doth very coldly handle the matter: vvh whereas you haue heard
 (I hope) sufficiently out of him, howe resolute and peremptory he is for

See the be-
 ginning of
 it, and
 cap. 4.

Lib. 9.
 Confess.
 cap. 13.

Purgatory. And in that said booke his principall intent is, to approue
 the burying of the dead neare vnto the body or reliques of some Martir, to
 the intent that he, vvho remembreth the body of his best beloued to be
 there buried, may vvith greater deuotion recommend vnto the same
 Martir, his deare friendes soule. And therefore he doth much commend
 a deuout Matron, for burying her sonne neare vnto the reliques of S. *Felix*,
 and counsaileth others so to doe, adding: that if they cannot procure any
 such burying place for their friendes, yet, that in no case they ought to
 cease from necessary prayers and supplications for them: For (saith he)
 where soeuer the body of the departed doe lie, the rest and peace of his soule, is to
 be procured and sought for. And whether our of fond affection towards his
 mother, or out of a most settled iudgement he prayed for her; and vvhe-
 ther it were coldly or no, let his owne wordes declare: thus he beginneth
 to proue *Caluin* an audacious lyer. But now I hauing my hart cured of that
 wound, in vvich humane affection might be faulty, doe powre forth vnto thee
 (our God) for that thy seruant (his mother *Monica*) another manner of teares,
 vvich floweth from a minde stricken vvith feare, by consideration of those perils,
 vvich follow every soule that dyeth in Adam, &c. I therefore (o my prayse,
 my life, and God of my hart) laying aside for a season her good vvorkes, for vvich I
 reioycing doe giue thee thanks, doe now pray vnto thee for the sinnes of my Mo-
 ther; heare me (I beseech thee) through the salue of our wounds, that hanged
 vpon

upon the tree, and now sitting at thy right hand, dost plead for vs. I know that shee did many worker of mercy, and from her hart forgave all them that trespassed against her: doe thou (ô Lord) also forgive her her trespasses, if shee committed any after baptisme: Pardon her, pardon her. (ô Lord) I beseech thee, and enter not into judgement with her: let thy mercy surpasse thy judgements, because thy wordes are true, and thou hast promised mercy to the mercifull, &c.

Could that most vvorthy Doctor more directly crosse Caluins false relation, of his coldnesse in this matter? or in better manner cleare himselfe from his spirefull slaunders? Calvin blushed not to say, that *S. Augustine* out of passion prayed for his mother: but he himselfe relateth, howe he did it some yeares after her death of settled judgement, hauing his hart cured from humane affection. And thus I end this question of Purgatory.

OF THE SUPREMACY IN

CAUSES ECCLESIASTICAL

OVR CONSENT.

M. PERKINS Page 283.

Touching the point of Supremacy Ecclesiasticall, I will set downe howe neare we may come vnto the Roman Church in two conclusions.

The first conclusion. For the founding of the primitive Church, the Ministry of the word was distinguished by degrees not only of order, but also of power, and Peter was called to the highest degree; for Apostles were aboue Euangelists, and Euangelists aboue Pastors and teachers: nowe Peter was an Apostle, and so aboue all Euangelists and Pastors. howe neuer be were not aboue other Apostles.

The second conclusion. Among the 12. Apostles, Peter had a three-fold priuiledge or prerogative: first, of authority, I meane a prebeminence in regard of estimation, whereby he was in reuerence aboue the rest of the rest. Secondly, of primacy, because he was the first named in the fore-man of the quest. Thirdly, of principality, in regard of measure of grace, wherein he excelled the rest of the rest; but Paul excelled Peter every way, in learning, Zeale, and vnderstanding, as farre as Peter excelled the rest.

ANNOTATION.

MAfter PERKINS (as his manner is) at the first vvould seeme to approach somewhat neare vnto the Catholike doctrine, and therefore giueth

gineth as braue wordes for *S. Peters* prerogatiues, as we doe, to wit; That he surpassed the other Apostles both in authority, primacy, and principality: but p^{er}u^{er}sely (after his old fashion) he watereth his former wordes with such cold glosses, that they shrinke in exceedingly; for all *Peters* priuiledges doe extend no further, then that he excelled the rest in priuate grace of learning, zeale, and vnderstanding, and was therefore somewhat more esteemed then the rest, and named first: so that with *M. PER.* a great mill-post, is quickly thwited (as they say) into a pudding pricke. Againe, all this is besides the purpose: for the question is not vvhich of the Apostles excelled in those priuate gifts of vnderstanding, zeale, and piety; for it is not vnlikely that *S. Iohn* the Euangelist (who sucked diuine mysteries out of our Saviours breast) was not inferior to either *S. Peter* or *S. Paul*, in these spirituall graces of heavenly knowledge and charity: but vve leauing these secretes vnto him vvhich is the iudge of the hart, and of his inward gifts, doe affirme *S. Peter* to haue beene aduanced aboue all the rest of the Apostles, in the externall gouernement of Christes Church; and the Bishops of Rome his successors, to inherite the same supremacy.

THE DIFFERENCE by *M. PERKINS.*

THe Church of Rome giueth to Peter a supremacy vnder Christ aboue all persons and causes: this standeth in a power to determine which bookes of Scripture be Canonically, and what is the true sence of any doubtfull place of them; and for this purpose to call and assemble generall Councils, and to confirme the decrees of them, and by these meanes to decide all controversies about matter of faith. Besides, he can excommunicate any Christian be he King or Caesar, if they by obstinate withstanding Gods lawes or the decrees of holy Church, shal justly deserve it. Moreover, to him it doth belong to make Ecclesiasticall Canons and lawes, for the due discipline and ordering of matters of the Church, which doe binde in conscience. Finally, to confirme the election of Bishops, and to decide all such greater controversies, as by appeale are brought vnto him from any part of Christendome.

These indeede be the chiefest points of the Popes supremacy: as for that of pardoning of sinnes, it is no proper part of his primacy, but common vnto all; not only to Bishops, but also to Priests.

We (saith *M. PERKINS*) hold, that neither Peter nor any Bishop of Rome, had or hath any such supremacy ouer the Catholike Church: but that all supremacy vnder Christ, is appertaining to Kinges and Princes with in their Dominions. And that our doctrine is good and theirs false, I will make manifest by sundry reasons. First, Christ must be considered as he was a King, two wayes: first, as he is God, so is he King ouer al by right of creation; and so as God hath deputed an earth to gouerne the world, namely Kinges and Princes. Secondly, he is King by right of redemption

redemption ouer the whole Church, which he hath redeemed with his precious blood; and so as mediator and redeemer, he hath no fellow nor deputy: for no creature is capable of this office, to doe in the roome and stead of Christ that which himselfe doth; because euery worke of the mediator must arise from the effectes of two natures concurring in one action, namely the God-head and Man-hood. Again, Christes Priest-hood cannot passe from his person to any other; whence it followeth, that neyther his Kingly, nor his Prophetickall (he would haue said Priestly) office, can passe from him to any creature. Nay, it is needlesse for Christ to haue a deputy, considering that a deputy only serueth to supply the absence of the principall: whereas Christ is alwayes present by his word and spirit, it may be said that the Ministers in the worke of the ministry are Christes deputies. I answer, that they are no deputies, but only athena instruments; because they doe only utter the word, but it is Christ that worketh in the hart. In like manner in excommunication, it is Christ that cutteth that excommunicate person from the Kingdome of heauen; and the Church doth only declare this, by cutting him off from the rest of Christes people, untill he repen: so that in all Ecclesiasticall actions, Christ hath no deputies but only instruments, the whole action being personall in respect of Christ.

Is not this trowe you a pretty peece of an argument? but we must beare with the length of it, because it alone will serue (as M. P. R. opineth) to ouerthrowe many points of Popery: let it be therefore wel considered. To it then I say first, that if it be ought worth, it as well ouerthroweth the Kinges, as the Popes Supremacy. For if the Pope may not be Christes deputy, as he is mediator and gouernour of his Church, because that no creature can be his deputy in any point of Ecclesiasticall gouernement as M. P. R. defineth; then surely no King nor Prince, who are meere creatures (and not one of them I trowe, both God and Man) can be Christes deputy in the gouernement of his Church. I say secondly, that a meere creature may be Christ our mediators deputy and Vicar in the Ecclesiasticall gouernement of his Church: neyther is there therein any one action, that necessarily proceedeth from the two natures of God and Man, as M. P. R. dreameth. Examine all the points of Supremacy proposed in the difference by himselfe, and see whether there be any one that must needs be the action of both God and Man: to call a generall Councell is none such, nor to ratifie the decrees thereof, to discusse and declare which bookes be Canonickall Scripture, and what is the true meaning of all obscure places therein contayned, may be done by men assisted by the inspiration of the holy Ghost: and so among all the rest, there is not one point of the Supremacy, but may be vvell executed by a mortall man assisted with Gods spirit. The points of Christes mediation, namely to satisfie

his Fathers vvrath by paying him the full ranfome of all mankinde; the establishing of a newe Testament or lawe; the creation of spirituall Magistrates; the furnishing of it with Sacraments, and such like are indeede so proper to Christ, that they cannot be communicated vnto others: Marry, to see that his lawes be vvell obserued, lawfull Gouernours and Ministers elected; and his Sacraments rightly administered; the charge (I say) of these thinges may be very vvell committed vnto his deputies, and the principall ouer-sight of all vnto one supreme gouernour vnder himselfe, that all the inferiour Prelates may be holden in peace and vnity. And to say that Christes presence, by his vvord and spirit is sufficient to dissolue all doubttes that arise about matter of faith, and to reforme all misdemeanour that is among Christians, without the authority of some Magistrate to see the same vvell declared, and applied vnto particular persons; is to speake against all reason and experience. For vvho shall reforme obstinate *Hertikes*? Christes vvord? but *Hertikes* haue alwayes said, and will euer say that it maketh for them. Shall Christes spirit correct them? they hold that they haue that spirit in such abundance, that it cryeth in them, *Abba, Father*: so that M. P. *AR.* argument driueth to this, that there must be no gouernour at all; but that euery wrangling fellowe, is to be left vnto the vvord and spirit of Christ: vvhich is most absurd in matter of gouernement. And albeit that in producing of supernaturall effectes, men be but Gods instruments: yet because they be instruments indued with reason, chosen by God, and enabled to doe that wherunto they are by Christ appointed; I see no reason why they may not be well called Christes *deputies*. Sure I am, that *S. Paul* feareth not to stile himselfe with the other Apostles, *Christes Legates or Ambassadors*: which is as much, if not more then his deputies. And in an other place, he goeth yet further, and saith; that *they are coadjutors, or fellowe workers with God*: for though it be Gods worke, as the only *efficient cause*; yet men doe concurre therunto as his *instruments*; and doe in their kinde worke properly towards the producing of the effect: as the Preacher by his perswasions, zeale, and piety, doth very much moue his Auditors to embrace Godliness, although he should labour in vaine if God did not principally both concurre with his speeches, and inwardly also dispose the hart of the hearer to receive them. But of this more hereafter in the matter of the Sacraments.

Touching the matter of gouernement, I cannot vnderstand what M. P. *AR.* meaneth when he saith, that euery action thereof proceedeth from the very person of Christ: for vvhen the Bishops or congregation doth excommunicate an offendour, howe can that act of theirs be personal in respect

clearly by speciall revelation from God, without consulting with any of the rest; therefore to him alone was that promise of Christ made; although in, and by him, to the great benefit of the whole Church.

In cap. 16.

Math.

But Theophilus hath said that they were the gift of a Bishop, but the power of committing and binding as Peter had.

In psal 38

Answer. We grant that all lawfull Bishops can binde and loose, both in the court of conscience and publickly; but thereof it followeth not, that that promise of Christ for building his Church on *S. Peter*, &c. was common vnto the rest of the Apostles: *But* Ambrose saith, that which is said to Peter, is said to the Apostles: Then belike that was also said vnto the rest as well as to him; This might be the Cause were we wise, thou shalt denie us this, which no man can say.

To vnderstand then such generall propositions, take this distinction with you, that things spoken vnto *S. Peter* are of three kindes of sort. Some are spoken vnto him as an ordinary Christian; and such sentences doe agree vnto all Christians: others things are spoken vnto him, as an Apostle, and those are common vnto the rest of the Apostles: there be lastly certayne things spoken vnto him particularly, as head of the Church, which may not be extended vnto any other of the Apostles, but only vnto his successors.

Nowe *S. Ambrose* speaketh of the second kinde of things: but against this *M. Bax.* excepteth thus: That although Peter be admitted to haue been in commission about the rest for the time, yet hence may not be gathered any supremacy for the Bishops of Rome; because the authority of the Apostles were personal, and consequently ceased with them, without being conueyed vnto any others; and he addeth the reason of this to be; because that when the Church of the new Testament was first founded, it was needfull only, that there should be Pastors and Teachers for the building of it vp, vnto the worldes end.

Reply. What meaneth this man by Pastors? doth he comprehend Bishops within that word when he overthroweth himselfe: for if such Pastors be yet necessary, then is it needfull that the Bishops of Rome doe succede *S. Peter* in that ample power which he had. If by Pastor, he vnderstand Parish Priests or Ministers that haue charge of flockes, and by Teachers other Preachers; then doth he here as much for the Bishops, as in his last discourse he did for temporall Princes; that is: at he vent about there to proue, that Christ as our redeemer, could haue no creature for his deputy in gouernement; and consequently that Kings cannot be Christs Lieutenants in Ecclesiasticall causes: so here he doth insinuate, that Bishops be not necessary to the building vp of Christs Church, but the Minister of euery Parish with the Elders thereof, will suffice for ordinary matters;

maters; and that affaires of greater moment must be referred (like) to the Confessoriall assembly of many Ministers and Elders together. Doth not this fauour publicly of Puritanisme: but because he only fitt this without any proofe, let it suffice for answer to say; that as Ministers are necessary to teach the word of God, and to administer the Sacraments: so are Bishops both to institute and ordayne the Ministers, and to see, that they doe diligently discharge their duty. And as Bishops are necessary to ouer-see Priests and Ministers: so are Archbishops and Metropolitans to looke vnto Bishops, and to provide that there be no schismes or diuisions among them, and to determine their controuersies, if any arise betwene them. And in like manner one Supreme Pastor is necessary in the Vniuersall Church of Christ, to hold all Archbishops, Primates, and Patriarkes in vniity of faith, and in conformity of Christian ceremonies and manners.

M. P. FIRST third reason: *When the Sonnes of Zebulon sued vnto Christ for the greatest rooms of honour in his Kingdom, Christ answered vnto them, You knowe that the Lordes of the Gentiles haue dominion; and they that are great, exercise authority ouer them: (but it shall not be so with you) Bernard applyeth this to Pope Eugenius on this manner; it is plain that here dominion is forbidden the Apostles; goe to them, dare you (if you will) take vpon you ruling an Apostle? or in your Apostleship rule and dominion? if you will haue both alike, you shall loose both: rather wise you must not think your selfe excepted from the number of them, of whomes he Lord complained, ye haue enlarged, but not of me.*

Lib. 2. do
confid.

Answer. Insolent and tyrannicall Domination, such as was in those daies practised by the Gentils, Pagans, and Idolaters, is there by our Saviour forbidden the Apostles; but not modest and vigilan Prelature in Ecclesiasticall government, as the very text it selfe doth plainly shewe: for in that he doth foretel that there should not be such a haughty & disdainful kinde of superiority among his disciples, he doth giue vs to vnderstand that there should be some other bettes; and saith further, *That he who is greater among you, let him become as the lesser, and he that is your leader* (for as it is in the Greekes *agomazo* your Captaine or Prince) *let him be your wayers.* See, he will haue among them one greater then the rest, to be their Capayne and leader, which he confirmeth with his owne example, saying: *As my selfe came not to be serued on, or ministered vnto, but come to minister on to many others:* for that this discourse of our Saviours, only disprooueth in Christians such Lord-like domination as was then in vse among the Gentils, who were giuen for the most part, to take their owne pleasures to ouer-rule lawes as they listed, to oppresse their subjects with taxes, and

Luc. 22.
vers. 26.

to vschew like slaues. Nowe in Ecclesiasticall gouernement all must be otherwise: the Prelate must not seeke his owne ease, wealth, or pleasure, but most vigilantly study day and night to feede and profite his flocke, with whom he must conuerse most modestly, not learning or contemning to speake familiarly, with the meaneest amongst them. And this is that which S. Bernard counsaileth Eugenius to doe: *To rule as an Apostle, and not to ouer-rule or to dominie like vnto some temporal Princes:* which in the same booke he doth plainly teach, saying: *That when Eugenius was created Pope, he then was exalted ouer Nations and Kingdomes, yet not to dominate ouer them, but to serue them.* And further, he doth in the same booke deliuer the *Pope's Supremacy* in the most euident wordes, speaking thus to the same Pope Eugenius: *Who art thou? a great Priest, the highest Bishop, thou art the Prince of the Bishops, the heire of the Apostles, &c.* Then art thou whom the keyes of heauen were deliuered, to whom the sheepe were committed, There are also in dede other Porters of heauen, and Pastors of sheepe, but thou art so much the more glorious, as thou hast inherited a more excellent name about thee. *Thou hast thine flockes to each man auey, but to thee all were committed, as one flocke to one Pastor. Thou art namely Pastor of the sheepe, but of all other Pastors, thou alone art the Pastor.* Thus saith S. Bernard, and much more doth he say in fauour of the *Pope's Supremacy* in the same booke: vvhich to pike out a broken sentence of his against ouer-ruling, thereby to disproue that which he doth most plainly proue and allowe, argueth an euill conscience in M. PARISHES, and a minde fully bent to deceiue them that be so simple as to beleene him.

Ephes. 4. His fourth reason: *Mention is made of gifts, which Christ gave to his Church after his ascension, whereby some were Apostles, some Prophets, some Euangelists, some Pastors, some Teachers: none of these had bene an office, in which men at deputies of Christ should haue gouerned the whole Church, that calling might bene haue bene named; and no doubt but that Paul would not haue concealed it, where he mentioneth callings of less importance.*

Answer. This man will neuer leave playing the Sophister, and vsing of fallacies in steade of sound arguments: vvhich a reason is this: there is no mention made of the supreme Pastor calling in one place of S. Paul, therefore there is no mention made of it at all. Let vs returne this his weapon vpon his owne pate: In that place of the Apostle, there is no mention made of the Kinges supreme authority in causes Ecclesiasticall, but rather a playne declaration that the Church of God needeth no such officer for her Ecclesiasticall gouernement: *ergo*, Kinges haue no such authority. And because M. PARISHES seemeth not greatly to care for the Princes supremacy, let this argument be vrged against the admirable Elders of their

consistoriall

consistoriall discipline; vvhho notwithstanding they be such peerlesse peeres of the reformed Churches, yet were viterly concealed; or rather neuer thought vpon by the Apostle, when and where he mentioneth callings of lesser moment. Nowe the direct answer to that place may be twofold: eyther that there is not mention made of all Church officers, as it is euident and must be confessed on all parts; or else that by conuenient interpretation, they may be reduced vnto some of them there named, and so may the supreme Pastor of Christes Church be containned well in that name of Pastors; or because it belongeth vnto the supreme Pastor to haue a generall care of all Christendome, and to send alwayes some to conuert Infidels, his charge and calling may be well an *Apostleship*: as it is in the very wordes cited by M. PER. in his last argument out of S. Bernard. Be-
fides, S. Augustine; and S. Hierome with others doe call the Sea of Rome an
Apostolicall chayre and seate.

Epist. 162.
Lib. 2. 487.
Ruffinum.

M. PERKINS siterason: The Popes supremacy is condemned by sentences of Scripture, before it was manifest to the world; by the spirit of prophesie, to wit, the man of sinne (which is Antichrist) shall exalt himselfe above all that is called God: wvth this whole Chapter with all the circumstances of it, most fully agreed to the sea of Rome, and the head thereof.

2. Thess. 2.

Answer. This is a capitall accusation, and therefore should haue bin thoroughly well proued, and yet you vould meruaile to see how sleight-ly he goeth about it: I can scarce bring his prooff into any forme of argument, it is so substantiall. But thus he seemeth to argue: *As the decay of the Roman Empire the man of sinne shal be reuealed: but the Sea of Rome neuer flourished till the Empire decayed; ergo, that Sea is the man of sinne.* Here is a newe found manner of arguing: Let vs admit the first proposition, because it may hap to be true, though it be very vncertaine what is meant by that defetition mentioned by S. Paul. But let vs graunt it: shall euery thing that beginneth then to flourish, be the man of sinne? and if euery flourishing state shall not then be that man of sinne, vvhy shall the Sea of Rome be rather than man of sinne, then any other flourishing estate? sure it is, that it hath no consequence out of that argument. Secondly, it is most false also, that the Sea of Rome neuer flourished till the Empire decayed: for when did it euer flourish more, then in that good Emperors daies Constantine the great; and in many other excellent Christian Emperors that liued an hundred yeaes after him? Thirdly S. Paul speaketh not of a decay of the Roman Empire, or vvhatsoever else he meaneth; but rather of a generall reuolt, or viter ruine and decay of it, vvwhich is not as yet happened: for the Empire to this day yet continueth in some part of Hungary and Beauland; so that man of sinne cannot be the Sea of Rome; vvwhich so

many

many yeares hath flourished together with that Roman Empire. Finally, S. Peter and three and thirty other Popes of Rome after him, enjoyed the supreme gouernement of the Church, more then foure hundred yeares before that declination & decay of the Roman Empire, which they speake off: so that nothing can be more fond and absurd, then to draw thence any argument against the Popes supremacy. And whereas he saith that all that chapter agreeth firly to the Sea of Rome, I say & will briefly proue, that nothing in that Chapter agreeth vnto it any thing aply. First, the Apostle speaketh of one particular man, as his vvordes doe manifestly shew:

- Vers. 3.* for he calleth him *the man of sinne, the sonne of perdition*, and that with the Greeke article which doth more formally particularize; howe can this be applyed vnto more then two hundred Popes? Secondly it is said, *that the man of sinne shall be extolled aboue all that is called God*; and as S. Chrysostome expoundeth it, shall command him selfe to be adored and worshipped as God, which is and hath euer bene most farr from the thoughtes of all Popes, vvho professe themselves seruants of all Gods seruants. Thirdly, *the man of iniquity shall worke many strange signes and wonders*; Let them name which of the Popes hath so done for these last 900. yeares, vvhich they accule most. Fourthly, that man shall be receiued of the *Iewes*; for saith *Vers. 10.* S. Paul, *Because they retained not the charity of truth, that they might be saved, therefore God will send them the operation of error to beleene lying*: now all the Greeke interpreters doe vnderstand this of the *Iewes*, as the very text teacheth them. With whome agreeth S. Hierome, interpreting these vvordes *Quaest. 11.* thus: *Antichrist shall doe all these signes not by the power, but by the permission of God for the Iewes*: that because they would not receiue the charity of truth, *ad Algaui* that is, the spirit of God by Christ, and so receiuing the Saviour, they might haue bene saved: God will send them, &c. With these accord both S. Augustine and S. Cyril, vpon this sentence of our Saviour speaking to the *Iewes*: *Iob. 5.* *I come to you in the name of my father, and you receiue me not: if any other shall*

Vers. 43. *come in his name, him you receiue, that is Antichrist*: but the *Iewes* haue not yet receiued the Bishop of Rome for their *Mesias*. Nay, they take the Pope for the greatest enemy of their religion in the world, and like much better of all them vvho vvith draw themselves from society in religion with him.

Vers. 9. Finally, it is there said, that *Christ with the spirit of his owne mouth shall kill that man, with the manifestation of his aduery or comming*: whence the learned interpreters gather, first, that Antichrist shall be punished with a very extraordinary and exemplare death, which hath not hapned to any of these Popes. Secondly, that Antichrist is to tyranize only some fewe yeares before the latter comming of Christ to iudgement, which cannot

stand

stand with the Protestants computation of Antichrists raigne, which they drawe nine hundredth yeares in length already, and yet are vncertaine how much tyme yett behind. By this (I hope) you see, howe well you may trust M. PARK on his word another time, who blushed not to affirme all the circumstances of the man of sinne related in that Chapter, to agree most fitly vnto the Pope of Rome: when as not one sentence there penned by the Apostle, doth touch him any whit at all, but are only by the wresting of his enemies, violently torne and cast vpon him.

Now to M. PERRINS last reason, which is taken from the testimony of the auncient Church. Cyprian saith: Doublesse the same were the rest of the Apostles that Peter was, indued with equall fellowship both of honour and power, but a beginning is made of vniuersity that the Church may appeare to be one. *De simpli. Prælator.*

Answer. Doublesse here is a pretty peece of cosinage; for the words are strooken out, which would haue made all playne against the Protestants: for S. Cyprian there saith, that the beginning proceeded from one, and the primacy is giuen to Peter, that the Church may appeare to be one: So that he allowing all the Apostles to be equall in honour, being all of the same calling and power to preach the Gospell to all nations, yett affirmeth the Supremacy to haue beene giuen vnto S. Peter; that by that vniuersity of one head, the Church might be kept perpetually in vniuersity of one faith, and vniuersity of religion. Note howe his owne vvitnesse doth giue playne euidence against him.

Gregory saith: If one be called vniuersall Bishop, the vniuersall Church goeth in regis. to decay. And cap. 144. I say boldly, that who soeuer calleth, or desireth to call himselfe vniuersall Priest, in his pride he is a fore-runner of Antichrist. And lib. 6. cap. 30. Behold in the preface of your Epistle a prouder title, calling me vniuersall Pope. *lib. 6. cap. 118.*

Answer. I could wish that the cause might be determined by that blessed Bishop S. Gregories sentence, it were then already gayned on our side: for in those bookes of his Epistles, he doth almost nothing else but declare the Popes Supremacy, in ordering of all Ecclesiasticall matters, and that ouer all Countries; but whence the Bee sucketh hony, thence also the Spider draweth some poyson. They regard not what or how much he writeth there in fauour of the Supremacy; but they thinke to haue some advantage for their cause, out of that which he writeth against the name of vniuersall Bishop or Priest, but they are miserably deceived: for one may very well be supreme head of the Church, and yett not vniuersall Bishop, as S. Gregory theretakerh that word. For he is only an vniuersall Bishop after S. Gregory, who is Bishop in euery Diocesse of the vniuersall Church, other Bishops being but his Suffraganes or Deputies: such an

vniuersall

vnuerfall Bishop is not the Pope; for excepting the speciall points of his prerogatiues, he is not to intermeddle with the particular businesse of any other Bishop within his Diocesse, no more then the Archbishop of Canterbury, is to deale with the gouernement of any other Bishop vnder him; fasting in cases of his prerogative. But euen as it appertayneth vnto the Metropolitan to compose the controuersies that may arise betwene the Bishops of his Prouince, and to determine all such causes as by appeale or otherwise belong vnto his court; to call a Prouinciall Councell, and to confirme the decrees of it, and to make Ecclesiasticall Canons and constitutions for his Prouince: in like manner doth it appertayne vnto the supreme Pastor of the Church, to appeale and end all debates that shal happen betwene the Metropolitans or Primates; to iudge of some such matters of great moment, that may by appeale be very worthyie referred to his court; to call generall Councils, and to be President in them; to make Ecclesiasticall lawes for the vvhole Church: in vvhich and such likematters, the point of his Supremacy principally consisteth. And these vvere all most carefully vndertaken and practised by *S. Gregory*, though he misliked the name of vnuerfall Bishop, because that did seeme vnto him to exclude all other Bishops from their proper dignities and callings, as he expoundeth himselfe, saying: *If there be one vnuerfall Bishop, it remaineth that you be no Bishops. And if you make one vnuerfall Patriarke, you deprive all the other Patriarkes of their title and dignity: l. 4. ep. 36.* In this sence tooke *S. Gregory* the name of vnuerfall, and therefore did justly refuse it himselfe, and very sharply reprehended the Patriarke of Constantinople, for vsurping of it: for although in a good sence it might haue beene attributed vnto the Sea of Rome, who is supreme Pastor of the vnuerfall Church; yet it could not without apparant pride and arrogancy, be vsed of the Patriarke of Constantinople, who had nothing to doe vwithout the compasse and limits of his owne Patriarkeship.

The testimony of *S. Bernard* is easie to be answered: for he saith only, that *Eugenius is not Lord of Bishops*; but one of them: and that he is not to drawe all power to himselfe, but to leaue to euery Bishop and Archbishop (his bretheren in gouernement) their proper caules; all vvhich we say with him.

But he returneth to Pope Gregory, who saith: *That he was subject to the Emperours commandement: and had euery way discharged that which was due; in that he had performed his allegiance vnto the Emperour, and yet did not conueale what he thought in Gods behalfe.*

Answer. VVhy did he not cite the place where *S. Gregory* hath these wordes: there lurketh some padde vnder that strawe: but he might very well

*Lib. 7. c.
pist. 69.*

his imperiall commandments, to be but an vsuall Italian phrase. And with what congruity he citeth one of them to professe obedience of curtesie to the Emperour, whome they account to haue bene no better then *Antichrist* in his full pride, and to haue acknowledged no other man for his head, yea to haue extolled himselfe aboute God, as they blaspheme, I leave it to the consideration of the wise. Hitherto in answer of M. PERKINS objection, on against the Popes supremacy.

It followed in due order, that hauing disputed against that, he should haue confirmed his owne opinion for the supremacy of Kings & Princes: for it doth not followe necessarily, that if the Pope be not head of the Church, that then the King is; for Patriarkes or Primates may be in the severall Provinces; or else the graue learned Senate of consistoriall Ministers and rude artificers, called (forsooth) *Elders of the congregation*. But M. P. towards the end of his booke waxeth slouthfull, and hath omitted also to propose any argument in our behalf; yea he doth not propose one reason in prooffe of his owne position. Nay, which is most reprobable, he doth in his owne arguments made against the Popes supremacy, utterly subuert the Kings supremacy, as you haue heard already in his first and fourth reasons. To which I will adde a third, gathered out of him in an hundred places.

Nothing is to be beleued as necessary to salvation, that is not written in the word of God: but it is not written any where in the new Testament, that our Saviour Christ committed the gouernment of his Church vnto King or temporal Princes; therefore no such thing is to be beleued or taught by any Christian. There is so little said in fauour of their Supremacies in holy Scriptures, that M. P. held it good policy not to goe about the probation of it. Some are so simple as to alledge that of the Apostle S. Paul in prooffe of it: Let every soule be subject to higher powers; but it falleth many feadomes to short of it: for that sentence may be as well applied to spirituall as to temporall gouernours. Again, if he speaks of temporall Magistrates, most assured is it that he meaneth nothing lesse, then to downfaile the Christians Roway to obey their Emperours (who were then Pagans and persecutors) in matter of religion. The same answer will serue for their other text out of S. Peter, who biddeth Christians obey the King as the more excellent. More excellent then whom? what then Priests and Bishops? nothing lesse; but more excellent then their Dukes, Captaines, and such like officers vnder them, as it followeth in the text of which sort very fewe in S. Peters dayes were members of the Church; and much lesse supreme heades in cases Ecclesiasticall: so that there is no vvarrant in alle the newe Testament for Kings supremacy in matters of religion, and as little is there

in the old, as shall be examined in due place; vvherefore not to be beleue-
 ned of any *Protestant*. And in very equity and true naturall light, how is
 it likely that temporall Princes both slenderly studyed in matter of Diui-
 nity, and nothing practised in the manner of Ecclesiasticall gouernement,
 should be chosen as fittest persons to decide all doubt in Diuinity, and
 to order and determine all controuersie in Church gouernement? or shall
 we thinke that our Saviour had such a simple fore-sight, or slender care of
 his Church, as to commit it specially to their charge, vvho vvwere both
 least able, and most vnlikely to looke well vnto it? Women also and chil-
 dren may be lawfull Kinges; but to make them supreme Gouernours of
 causes Ecclesiasticall (vvherein children cannot, and vvomen may not
 speake) is most ridiculous. And if all other proofes fayled, the very ex-
 perience of our age were sufficient to perswade any reasonable man, that
 it is most absurd to be ruled by temporall Princes in matters of religion;
 for it would followe of it necessarily, that a Christian were bound to con-
 forme his conscience to the Kinges lawes, and to embrace that religion
 which the King commandeth him, because he is bound to obey his supe-
 rior appointed by God. And consequently my father for example, who
 liued in King *Henry* the eight, King *Edward*, Queene *Mary*, and
 Queene *Elizabeth* daies, should haue changed his religion foure times in
 his life, and that vvith a very good conscience; because he vvvas so com-
 manded to doe by the formall lawes of those foure his temporall Soue-
 raignes: and so might without any offence to God, haue bene nowe of
 the old religion, then of the newe; and againe of neither old nor newe,
 but of a horch-porch, and mingle-mangle of some of the one, and some of
 the other, vvwhich is most absurd: euen so is that of which it followeth.
 And to confirme this vvith some testimony of antiquity, *S. Ambrose* a most
 firme pillar of the West Church, spake resolutely vnto the Emperour
Valentinian, saying: *Trouble not your selfe (O Emperour) vvith thinking that*
you haue any imperiall iurisdiction ouer those things as be Diuine and Holy; for
the right of Ciuill causes was committed vnto you, but not the charge of Holy
things. And another his auncient *S. Athanasius*, the first of the foure Do-
 ctors of the *Greeke* Church, doth reprehend the Emperour *Constantine*
 for intermeddling vvith Ecclesiasticall causes; and recordeth an notable
 saying of that venerable Bishop *Hosius* (vvho vvvas present at the first ge-
 nerrall Councell of *Nyce*) vnto the same *Constantine*; to vvite: *Communa-
 re not (O Emperour) in this kinde of affaires; rather learne thesething at mee: for*
God hath committed the Empire to your charge; but hath bestowed vnto you
and put vnto trust, vvith the affaires that appertayne vnto his Church. And there-
 fore vvould not that most renowned Emperour *Constantine* the great

Epist. 35.

Epist. ad
solita. vi-
t. agites.

judge of Bishops causes, y although the Bishops themselves referred their matter to him, and requested him to compose them; but said, *That it did not belong unto him to judge them, but to be judged by them*: whose blessed steps the most learned and judicious Emperours that followed him, chose rather to follow then the evil example of his *Arrian* Some *Councils*. For *Constantine* the elder that famous lawe-maker, saith unto *Iohn* the second Pope of that name: *We doe not suffer any thing to passe that belongeth unto the state of the Church, but that we make it knowne unto your Holynes, who are the head of all the holy Church.*

In Codice
ii. primo.

Exat in-
ter pre-
ambulas
ad Concil.
Chalced.

And *Valentinian* the Emperour in an Epistle unto *Theodosius* wrote: *We will in our times minister unto the dignity of a state, and also unto the most blessed Apostle S. Peter, for as much as he the most happy Bishop of Rome (unto whom antiquity hath yielded the principality of Priestly office about all where) may have place and power to judge of matters of faith, and of Priests.* And thus much by the way, against the Supremacy of Princes in causes Ecclesiasticall. It remaineth now that I briefly prove *S. Paul* to have had this Supremacy in his time, and that therein the Bishops of Rome doe succcede him.

And for a foundation of this Question I take that for an assured truth, which the best Philosophers doe grant, and the practise of the best and greatest Kingdoms hath confirmed, to wit: *That in one Kingdom it is best to have one King and supreme governour, assisted with the counsell of his wisest subjects*; which is so well knowne and confessed generally, that he must needs be taken for a wrangler that will denie it: nowe then to our purpose. Christes Church is but one state or spirituall Kingdom, which hath but one faith, one baptisme and forme of Sacraments, one true religion and solemn manner of diuine seruice: Nowe being vve are not to doubt, but that he (who purchased himselfe this one Church, with the shedding of his owne most precious blood) would haue it gouerned in the best sort; therefore we must confesse, that he hath ordayned one supreme Governour of it. They say, that this supreme Pastor is Christ himselfe, and that he is alwayes present with iem spirit, and by his word; wherfore there needeth no deputy, or other in his roome. This I haue once before confuted, grounding that Christ is present to his Church in spirit, and that he both inwardly quicken and governeth it; but that is not sufficient, for whilse we haue one certayne person visibly present, to assure vs which is the word of God; and what is the true sense of all doubtfull places of it, we shall neuer haue unity of faith: for if they (who mistake the sense) must be left to their owne iudgements, and the direction of their owne spirit; which they beleeue to be guided with the holy Ghost, then shall vve haue so many torches turrant in the Church, as there be

*Whom hee to choyne and stampeth them. The like may be said for Sacraments and sacred rites of religion, the which without one Supreme Moderator, cannot be kept yniforme: so that it resteth most cleare, that our Saviour Christ being to leaue this world and to returne vnto his heauenly Father, he was to commit the high charge of his only Spouse and Dowe, vnto the custody and fidelity of one Supreme Pastor. This is confirmed by the example of the old Testament, which was a figure of the newe, where the soueraigne and supreme authority of deciding all doubtfull questions, that should arise about the lawes, was by Gods expresse order, given vnto the high Priests, and every Israelite bound vnder payne of death to obey him, and stand to his sentence. And that this Supremacy continued all along the state of the old Testament, even vntill Chaires dayes, both the *Magdeburgenses*, and *Calvin* doe testifie. But the Protestants object, that some Judges and Kinges of Iuda, did take vpon them to deale in matters appertaining to religion. I answer, that good Kinges as principall members of the temporall, ought to haue speciall regard to the preferuation of the seruice of God, and to see that matters of religion be duly ordered; because the peaceable gouernement of their temporall affaires, dependeth much vpon the concord, piety, and vertue of Ecclesiasticall persons: and therefore they are to sanctify and call vpon the Bishops and Gouernours of the Clergy, to redresse all disorders among them, but not to meddle by themselves as their superiours in spiritual causes: so did those good Kinges of *Israel*; as is recorded of one of the best of their King *Iosaphat*; who sought for reformation of Church matters, But *se-* 2. *Paralip.*
cond the Prescience of the things which appertaine vnto God, vnto *Amarias* 19.
the high Priest. And now a dayes we giue many priuiledges to Princes; as the denotation of most Bishops, and higher Magistrates of the Church; that the two states spirituall and temporal may the better agree, and liue more peaceably together. *S. Augustin* also doth declare it to be the duty of Kinges to defend the Church and her decrees, and to punish with seuerall lawes all Heretikes, and oiber condemned by the Church. But directly to the former objection, let the places of the old Testament be perused, where the authority and right of Kinges be specified, and you shall not finde in any one of them, that they were to haue the supreme gouernement in cases Ecclesiasticall; but where the first institution of Kinges is mentioned, *Thou* they are willed to receiue the exemplar and copy of the lawe, from the Priests of the tribe of *Leuy*. And in the same Chapter a little before, *All* men are bound to take the true exposition of the same lawe, not from the King, but from the high Priest of the same tribe of *Leuy*. Nowe if the lawe being but one nation, could not be kept in vniuersity of truth, without one supreme*

Deut. 17.
ab 8. ad
13.

Centur. 1.
lib. 1. c. 7.
Lib. 4. In-
stit. ca. 6.

2. Paralip.
19.

Deut. 17.
vers. 18.

Governour, what diuision in faith and religion would there be among all the nations of Christendome (which be so many, and so diuers) if there were not one supreme Pastor, to whose finall sentence they should all be obedient and bound to stand? first, then it is euident, that there must be one supreme Governour in the Church. Nowe to goe one stepp forward: this supreme authority was by our Saviour Christ Iesvs given vnto S. Peter; which I will proue both by the promise, and performance of it. The promise of this supremacy is recorded in these wordes: *Matb. 16. vers. 18.* *When thou sayest thou art Peter, and I will saye, thou art Christ the Sonne of the liuing God; and I will saye, thou art Peter, and thou shalt be the firme Rocke, vpon which I will build my Church, &c.* Whence I reason thus: That is the foundation in a building, which is the head in a body and supreme Governour in a common weale: for the foundation is first laid and doth vphold all the rest of the building; but our Saviour promised to build the spirituall common weale of his Church vpon Peter, as vpon a firme Rocke and foundation; therefore he meant to make him the head and chiefe Pastor vnder himselfe of it.

Some answer that Christ did not that he would build his Church vpon Peter; but vpon that Rocke which was himselfe; because that Christ is called a Rocke. *1. Cor. 10.*

Reply. This cannot be: for albeit Christ be the most firme foundation, and chiefe corner stone of all that building; yet hath it pleased him to appoint a Deputy and Vicar to gouerne in his absence vnder him, and so to communicate his Title in a certayne measure and degree, vnto his seruantes. He is the light of the world, and yet saith he to his Apostles, *Matb. 5. vers. 15.* *You are the light of the world. He is the Pastor of our soules; and he maketh them our Pastors: so he is the Rocke, that sustayneth all partes of the Church by his owne power and vertue, but hath imparted to Peter that name; to signifie, that he should be made able to beare the person of his Vicar on earth, and to rule vnder him, and by vertue receiued from him, the whole Church for his time. Nowe the very conside of the text doth conuince, that the Rocke there specified cannot be Christ: for it hath joyned with it, the word, *this*; and vpon this Rocke, which doth demonstrate and point out that which was spoken of immediately before; which was Peter: *Thou art Peter; and vpon this Rocke, &c.* Again, what congruity should there be in this sentence, to beginne with Peter, and to make shewe of bestowing some high reward on him for his noble confession; and in the end of it, to say that he would build his Church vpon himselfe? Thirdly,*

In the first sentence there is no question made, but that Christ did promise to Peter the keys of the Kingdoms of heauen; and not to reſerue them to himſelfe: therefore moſt certayne it is, that in the former ſentence he promiſed to build his Church vpon Peter. Finally, in the *ſynack* tongue (in which our Sauour then ſpoke) it is ſo playne, that it cannot be doubted of: for it is, thou art *Cephas*, and vpon this *Cephas* I will build my Church: nowe the word *Cephas* ſignifieth a rocke, or ſtone. Let vs to make the matter more maniſeſt, heare the iudgement of ſome of the auncient and moſt learned Fathers, of both the *Greeke* and *Latin* Church touching this expoſition.

S. Epiphanius. Our Lord made Peter (the chief of the *Apoſtles*) a ſure Rocke, vpon which the Church of God is builded.

S. Gregory Nazianzenus. Peter is called a Rocke, and hath the foundation of the Church committed vnto his fidelity.

S. Chryſoſtome. Our Lord ſaid, thou art Peter, and vpon thee will I build my Church.

S. Cyrill. Chriſt ſurely ſaid that he ſhould not be called Simon but Peter, by the name it ſelfe ſilly ſignifying, that he would build his Church vpon him, as on a Rocke and moſt ſure ſtane.

S. Cyprian. Our Lord did chooſe Peter the firſt of the *Apoſtles*, and vpon him did he build his Church.

S. Ambroſe ſaith: That Peter is called the Rocke, both becauſe he firſt of all laid the foundation in the actions of faith, and alſo for that as an vnumoueable ſtone, he doth ſuſtaine and hold together the frame and order of all the Chriſtian worke.

S. Hierome vpon that place: According vnto the metaphor of a Rocke, it is ſaith I ſaid to Peter, vpon thee will I build my Church.

S. Auguſtine ſometimes indeede giueth an other interpretation: but yet alloweth of this, and leaueſt it to the readers choiſe, adding: That in the time that Hymne of S. Ambroſe beganne to be chaunted publicly in the Church, that the Cocke crowing, the Rocke of the Church with ſeaſes waſhed away his fault: ſo common was that expoſition euen then, that the Rocke of the Church was taken for a ſufficient deſcription of S. Peters perſon.

By theſe plaine ſentences of the moſt approved Doctours of the church, may be expounded ſome others more obſcure, yvwhich ſay that vpon Peters faith or confeſſion Chriſt built his Church, in this manner: for the excellency of Peters faith and confeſſion, he was choſen to be the rocke or foundation of the Church; which is S. Baſils owne interpretation, who ſaith: that Peter for the excellencie of his faith, receaued the building of the Church vpon him. And in true reaſon, the Church being a congregation

In Anco-
rato.

Orat. de
mod. ſer-
uand. in
diſput.

Hom. 55

in Maib.

Lib. 2. in

Iob. ca. 2.

Epist. ad

Quirini.

Serm. 43

Matb. 16

Lib. 1.

retr. 1.

21.

Lib. 2. in

Eunomii.

his Church; I proue first by the word *pasce*, *feede*, or *be thou Pastor of my flocke*: for it doth signifie not bare feeding; but to feede as a sheepeheard doth his sheepe; which is not only to provide them meate; but to keepe them also from the woulfe, to cure their diseases; to leade or drive them whither he will; briefly to rule and governe them. And this word *pasce* and much more the Greeke *Poimaino* is frequent in holy Scripture; in this sense of governing; see *psal. 8. vers. 9. Thou shalt rule them in thy strength*; *Micah. 7. vers. 2. Nath. 2. vers. 6. Apostol. 19. vers. 14.* where the Greeke word, *Poimaino*, is put for to rule and governe. And in the *psal. 132. David* was chosen to *feede* his servant *Israhel*; and *Israhel* his inheritance; that was to rule over them; but like a good sheepeheard; mildly; vigilantly; and rather for the good of the sheepe; then for his owne pleasure or profit.

Nowe that the chiefe feeding and supreme gouernment of all Christes flocke was committed vnto him, it appeared first by those wordes of our Saviour to him: *Doest thou loue me more then these?* why should he require greater charity in *S. Peter* then in the rest of the Apostles; but for that he meant to aduance him to a charge about the rest; secondly, in that he committed to *Peter* the feeding of both *sheepe*, and *lambs*; that is: of both the Temporality, signified by the lambs; and of the Clergy; w^{ho} be sheepe; let vs heare *S. Ierome*: Again; *but he committed him absolutely without exception of any; his sheepe; feede my sheepe; he saith; he is the Pastor of his whole flocke*: as *S. Bernard* (whome *M. P. ER.* often allegeth against vs in this question) doth very learnedly inforce: *Thou (saith he) wilt aske me how I proue; that both sheepe and Pastor are committed and credited to him; I proue it by our Lordes words*: For *in the name of full (B. with two Ss) Bishops* and *Apostles* were the sheepe so absolutely without limitation committed; *Thou Ioue me Peter feede my sheepe*; he saith not the people of this Kingdome; or of that City; but my sheepe: whosoener therefore will acknowledge himselfe to be one of Christes sheepe; must submit himselfe to be gouerned by *S. Peter*; or by some of his successors. You see then by the very wordes and circumstances of the text, that the supremacy is giuen to *S. Peter*; let vs heare w^hicher the most learned and holy auncient Fathers; haue not so vnderstood them.

S. Chrysostome saith: To *Peter* our Lord after his resurrection said; *Feede my sheepe*; and builded his Church vpon him; as he is the stone which is the chiefe corner stone; *Epiphanius* in *Anacoreto*: *The Lord who beareth witness to him; feede my sheepe; to whom the felds are credited; alluding to that place, there shall be one Pastor and one fold.* *S. Chrysostome* why did our Lord shew this bloud? *to shew that he was the chiefe corner stone; the charge of whiche he committed to Peter and to his successors.* And a little after: *Christ would haue Peter indued with such authority; and to be farre*

above

Z. j.

above

.e. q. 2. u. l.

.12. 1. 1. 1. 1.

.e. p. di. I.

.d. 1. 1. 1. 1.

.e. 1. 1. 1. 1.

.12. 1. 1. 1. 1.

.e. 1. 1. 1. 1.

Serm. 3. de

annuif.

Assumpt.

1. 1. 1. 1.

Lib. 2. de

cap. 8.

De vnitat.

Eccles.

Iob. 30.

vers. 16.

Lib. 2. de

Sacra.

1. 1. 1. 1.

- alone all his other Apostles; for he saith; Peter doest thou loue me more then
 In cap. 2. theses see him also in his learned Commentaries vpon that text of S. Iohn:
 vers. 21. *Augustine* also vpon the same place, saith: That he committed his sheepe
 to Peter to be feede, that is (saith he) to be taught and gouerned. And because
 he produceth S. Gregory against vs, he must giue vs leaue to cite him for vs.
 Lib. 4. c. 2. He saith; It is euident to all that knewe the Gospell, that by our Lordes mouth
 pift. 76. the charge of the whole Church is committed vnto Peter, Prince of the Apostles;
 for vnto him it is said, Peter doest thou loue me? feede my sheepe: to him is
 Luc. 22. it also said, Behold Satan hath required to sift you as wheate, but I haue prayed for
 vers. 31. thee, that thy faith faile not; and thou once connected, confirme thy bretheren. See
 By the same places of holy Scripture (to omit for breuitie sake twenty
 others) it is cleare enough to them who desire so to see the truth, that S. Peter
 by our Saviours owne choise and appointments, was not only preferred
 before all the rest of the Apostles in some particular gifts, but was made
 also gouernour of his Church.
 Nowe what which M. R. x. b. x. letteth fill by the way, That though
 Peter excelled the rest of the Apostles, yet Paul passed him euery way: this said
 he boldly and barely without any author, or any shewe of prooffe; but
 Galat. 2. he vs in kinde, he helpe him to proue it. First, S. Paul saith a Iewes
 vs. 9. Cephas, and John, who sometime be the pillars, gave me and Barnabas the
 right hand of fellowship; now if he were fellowe with the best, he was not in-
 ferious to Peter.
 And answered In an orderly fellowship there is ordinarily one head and
 chief commander; and so S. Paul might be very well admitted into that
 holy society and fellowship of preaching the Gospell, and yet be vnder
 the President and Master of that Colledge or company; S. Peter.
 Secondly, S. Paul further saith: That the Gospell of the prepsure, (that is,
 the preaching vnto the Gentile) was committed vnto him, as the charge of the
 Israelites was vnto S. Peter: therefore he was S. Peters equall at least, and per-
 haps his superiour. Because a larger commission was granted vnto him.
 No answer. At partition of preaching the Gospell vnto all nations, was
 made by common consent among the Apostles, and in some that S. Paul
 (who was called afterward) was admitted in S. Peters circuit or quarter;
 vvhertupon for the more orderly proceeding in that blessed worke, it
 was agreed vpon by them, that S. Paul should haue principall care of the
 Gentils, and S. Peter of the Iewes: not that each of them might not also
 deale with both Iewes and Gentils, (for S. Peter was the first of all others,
 that by reuelacion from heauen did conuert the Gentils, as he testifieth
 saying: Brethren you knowe that God chose, that by my mouth the Gentils
 should heare the word of God and beleene:) yet because men commonly doe
 most

most tender and affect that, which is more specially committed to their charge; to *S. Paul* were the *Gentils* recommended; as to *S. Peter* the care of the *Jewes*. But this might be very well done, and yet *S. Paul* be inferior vnto *S. Peter* and owe him a reverent duty in the cases of supremacy; as the Bishops of *Cambridge* and *London* have charges of severall men and places; yet is *London* to acknowledge *Cambridge* as his superiour. And if the other Apostles, who had also their diuisions and Diocesses a part were, neuertheless inferior vnto *S. Peter*: so might *S. Paul* be; notwithstanding his distinct charge.

Thirdly. *S. Paul* rebuffed *S. Peter* to his face and reprehended him for walking in misse: therefore he was rather his superiour.

Answer. Not so: for an inferior by vway of brotherly correction, may indecent sort reprehend his superiour, if he see him not to take good courtesies: I knowe well that *S. Hierome* following the opinion of most of the *Greeke* Fathers, doth cleare *S. Peter* of all fault, holding it to haue bene but a set match betweene the two great Apostles, that one of them for the instruction of others, should reprehend the other. But admitting with *S. Augustine* that *S. Peter* was worthy blame, and therefore justly reprehended by *S. Paul*; yet thence will followe no derogation to *S. Peter*'s dignity, but great commendation of his humility, as the holy Fathers of that opinion doe gather. Of it thus writeth *S. Cyprien*: Neither did *Peter* whom our Lord chose the first, and upon whom he built his Church, when *Paul* disputed with him about circumcision, arrogate to himselfe any thing, saying that he had the primacy, and therefore the latter disciple ought rather to obey him, than to be it in good part.

S. Augustine saith: *Peter* gave to his posterity a more rare and holy example, that they should not disdain to be corrected of their juniours, then *Paul*; that infirmities (sauiug their charity) might confidently resist their superiours for the defence of truth.

And *S. Gregory* the great, speaking of *S. Peter*, saith: He reled vnto his inferior brother, and in that matter became a follower of his juniour, to be end he might excell in this point: that he who was chiefest in the toppe of the Apostleship, might be chiefest also in humility. Thus much of *S. Paul*'s supremacy: Nowe that the *Pope* of *Rome* doe succcede him in the same authority.

First, that this Monarchy and soueraigne authority of one ouer all the rest, was not to expire and end with *S. Peter* (as *M. P.* dreameth) but to continue in *Christes* Church vntill the end of the world, is cleare and euident to them who consider, that this Supremacy was not given vnto *S. Peter* principally for his owne honour and advancement, but for the benefit of the Church, to preferre and maintaine vniuity and peace among

1. 1. 1. 1.
1. 1. 1. 1.

Epist. 71.
ad Quin-
tum.

Epist. 19.
ad Hiero.

Hom. 18.
in Ezecb.

L. x. cont.
Ionian.

all his loving and obedient children, according vnto that of *S. Hierome*
Among the twelve Apostles one was chosen; thus a head being established; the oc-
casion of schisme and division might be prevented and taken away. If therefore
it were thought necessary vnto the wisdom of God; Christ Iesus, to
appoint one head among the Apostles, and a few of the best Christians
(who had the first fruites of his holy Spirit) to cut off dissention; and to
maintayne peace; how much more neede hath there beene ever since
of one supreme Pastor and moderatour of controuersies; vwhen the num-
ber of Christians is so greatly increased, and such variety of nations are
ingrafted & incorporated into it: when through the diuersity of wits and
judgements and the decay of charity; there must needs be a thousand
times more neede of the supreme authority of some one, to hold all the
rest together in the vniue of faith and religion. Againe, in the old Testa-
ment and lawe of *Moses* (which was a figure of the new) the same forme
of gouernement by one head and finall iudge in spirituall matters; vvas
at first established, and continued euer after without alteration, till
Christes first coming: Euen so must the same Ecclesiasticall Hierarchy
(which our blessed Saviour hath deified, framed, and founded) stand
alwaies firme and inuolable, vntill his second coming; for he hath built
it vpon so firme a Rocke, that all gates shall not preuaile against it: vvhich
may be further confirmed, if we vverigh vvell of vvharmoment and im-
portance it is, to alter and change the forme of gouernement. For it is of
no lesse moment, then to alter the whole estate of Christs common-weale,
the very essence, forme, and vniue of a publike state, consisting princi-
pally in the manner and order of ruling of it: vvhich alteration and varie-
ty to imagine to haue hapned in Christs Church, is to make many seams
in his vnolued garments, or rather to rippe it, and rent the vniue thereof
into many peeces: It being therefore a most certayne truth, that the same
supreme gouernement vvhich *S. Peter* had ouer the rest, vvas to continue
alwaies in Christs Church; it followeth as plainely, that the Bishops
of *Rome* vverre to succede him in that soveraigne authority: for the very
light of nature and common custome of all nations doth teach vs, that he
vvhoe succedeth vnto another in any established estate and calling, doth
at his lawfull entailement therein, enter into full possession of all the rights,
dignities, and priuiledges thereto belonging. For example, vwhen
one is crowned King of any nation, he presently there vpon is endowd
with all the power and prerogatiues, which his Predecessors in that King-
dome enjoyed before him. And to speake of spirituall Prelates, vvhoe
doubteth but that as soone as any Ecclesiasticall person is chosen & confir-
med (for example) Archbishop of *Canterbury*, that forth with he is

not only made gouernor of that Diocesse, but also Metropolitane and supreme Pastor of the Church of England; his very succession in that See; making him (as it were) inheritor vnto all the priuiledges and prerogatiues of his Predecessours in that seate: Euen so the Bishops of Rome succeeding vnto S. Peter in that Apostolicall See, doe inherite and succede him in that supreme authority, which Christ gaue vnto S. Peter, for to be continued in his Church vntill the worldes end. Now to auouch as some desperately doe, that S. Peter did not die at Rome, nor neuer was at Rome; is so grosse and palpable an vntruth, auerred by meere ghesse and phantasie, contrary to the euident testimony of all auncient fathers, and repugnant vnto the expresse and sensible monuments of the place of his execution, of his reliques, and Churches (builded by *Constantine* the great to the perpetuall remembrance of them) in the City of Rome, yet to this day most famously knowne through the world: this their assertion is (I say) so blockish and impudent, that it were but lost time to stand about the prooffe of it; for he that is so senselesse as to beleue such a paradoxe, deserveth small paynes for his recovery.

But for an vphor of this question, let vs heare the opinions of the principal Doctors of the East Church, who of all men are most likely not to attribute any such supremacy vnto a Bishop of the West Church, if they had thought it due vnto any Patriarke of theirs, or if they had not judged it to be a cleare case in true Diuinity, that such soueraigne authority was due vnto that one chiefe Pastor in Gods Church. The first shall be one the auncientest of them, that most worthy champion of Christ *Athanasius*, who was also one of the chiefeest Patriarkes of the East Church, as being Bishop of *Alexandria*: He in a speciall treatise (of *Dionysius* one of his predecessours in that See) sheweth, howe he went to Rome to another *Dionysius* then Pope, there to haue his cause heard and determined: which he would not haue done if he had not acknowledged the Bishop of Rome for his superiour, and one, to whose finall sentence, all of the East Church as well as of the West, were bound to obey. And in his Epistle vnto Pope *Felix* he hath these wordes: God hath therefore placed you and your predecessours (Apostolicall Prelates) in the tower of superiority, and hath commanded you to take charge of all Churches, that you may succour and helpe vs. This Epistle indeede of *Athanasius* M. P. E. doth mislike, but because he sheweth not vvhetherfore, his authority vvill not serue to discredit it. But he saith as much in another of his, and of all the Bishops of *Egipt* joyned with him to Pope *Marke*, to wit: That they al vvith al committed to their charge, were and euer vvould be obedient vnto the Bishop of Rome. It is also recorded Lib. 3. *bis*. by the Ecclesiasticall Historiographer *Zozemene*, howe that both *Athanasius*,
usius,

nossus. Patriarke of Alexandria, and *Paule*. Patriarke of Constantinople, with diuers others of the Greeke Church, being by the *Arrians* banished out of their owne Bishopricks, did flie vnto the Bishop of Rome for refuge: *Who* (as that authour witnesseth) because the care of all did belong vnto him, through the dignity of his place and state, did restore their Churches to euery of them. *Arbanus* also in his second Apology, hath recorded these words of the same most holy Pope *Iulius*, to the Bishops of the East: Are you ignorant this to be the custome, that first of all you must write vnto vs, that from hence, it may be desired what is just. Wherefore, if there had bene any such suspicion against the Bishop, you ought to haue related it to our Church of Rome: thus much of *S. Arbanus*, the first of the foure Greeke Doctors.

Nowe to the second *S. Gregory Nazianzen*, who had bene also Patriarke of Constantinople, he saith, That the Church of Rome had alwaies maintained the true faith and opinion of God; as it became the City that was superior to all the world. His diuine companion *S. Basil*, aduertiseth *Arbanus*, That be thought it good to write vnto the Bishop of Rome, to heare their matters, and by the decrees of his judgement, to determine them: and because it was hard to send from thence, that the Pope would giue to certayne chosen men authority to compass their controversies, and to reverse and make void the actes of the Council of *Armini*. See what soueraignty this learned auncient Father of the East Church, doth attribute vnto the Church of Rome.

The very same doth that golden mouth, and most learned and holy Doctor *S. Chrysostome* acknowledge, writing vnto *Innocentius* the first Pope of Rome: Beseeching him that he would repeale and make void the wicked fact of the Patriarke of Alexandria, with a whole Councell of the East, and lay the Ecclesiasticall censures and punishments vpon them; which euery man knoweth that he could not haue done, if he had not power and jurisdiction ouer all the East Church.

Vnto these foure most firme pillars of the Greeke Church, let vs ioine one neighbour of theirs, little inferiour vnto them for either standing, learning, or authority, I meane *Theodore*, a Bishop in *Ash* that had 800. Churches vnder him. He notwithstanding his distance from Rome, writeth thus vnto *Leo* the first: I doe expect the sentence of your Apostolicall See, and in humble wise doe beseech your Holynesse, that your iust and right judgement may helpe me appealing vnto you; and that you will command me to write vnto you, to verifie that my doctrine is consonant to the Apostles. And in another Epistle to *Renatus* a Priest of Rome, he writeth: That the Heretikes had spoiled him of his Bishopricke, and cast him out of the Cities, without any reverence or respect of his gray-hayres: wherefore (saith he) I request you, that

you will perceive the most holy Archbishop Leo, that he will use his Apostolicall authority, and command vs to cometo your Councell, for that holy seate of Rome, holderh the stearne of governing all the Churches in the world. Well then to conclude this long and intricate question, seing the Bishops of Rome from all antiquity (as is to be seene in their decretall Epistles) haue ever chalen- ged this right of Supremacy ouer the whole Church, as the succellours of S. Peter: and that the very Patriarkes and principall Prelates, euen of the East Church (who were likelyest to haue resisted if they had seene a- ny cause vvhy) haue from the very beginning of the free practise of Ec- clesiasticall iurisdiction, acknowledged and confessed the same, and that finally the greatest, wisest, and best Emperours of both the Latin and Greeke Church, haue (as you haue heard before) declared the same right to appertayne vnto the said Roman Sea, the matter cannot be but cleare enough to all that list not to remaine vvranglers, vvhere the right of the Supremacy resteth.

OF THE EFFICACY OF THE

SACRAMENTS

OVR CONSENT.

M. PERKINS Page 195

He first conclusion. *We teach and beleue that the Sacraments are signes to represent Christ with his benefits to vs.*

The second conclusion. *We teach further, that the Sacra- ments are indeed instruments, whereby God offereth and giueth the fore said benefits to vs.*

THE DIFFERENCE.

The Catholikes teach, that the Sacraments are true and proper instrumen- ts, all causes, which being moued by God therunto, doe produce and giue grace to the worthy receiuer. Euen as the penne doth make the letter, or as the axe doth cut the wood, being thereto applyed by the workeman: so (for example) doth the Sacrament of baptisme wash away the finnes of the baptized, being by God there- unto ordayned, and rightly vsed by the Minister. But M. PERKINS holdeth, that the Sacraments haue no operation to that effect of forgiveness of finnes, but are only our ward meanes, which being applyed vnto the party, God of himselfe

doth immediately purge him from sinne, and not by meanes of the Sacraments. Again, whereas we require a fit disposition in the receiuer to make him capable of the grace presented, and exhibited vnto him; by the Sacrament; He holdeth, that all the vertue of the Sacrament consisteth in the receiuer. When beholding those signes from God in the hands of the Minister, must conceiue and imagine: First, that God himselfe by his own mouth doth promise him forgiveness and by name, remission of his sinnes, the signe and pledge whereof, is that Sacrament; which the minde considering reasoneth thus: be it as yet the elements are, to faith and repentance, shall receiue grace thereby; but I see the elements are, therefore shall I receiue from God increase of grace. Thus then faith is confirmed, not by the worke done, but by a kinde of reasoning; the proofs whereof is borrowed from the elements, being signes and pledges of Gods mercy.

Contrary he vve hold, that the Sacrament it selfe conferreth and doth give great grace, so that there be no impediment or let of it; by reason of the receiuers euill disposition. Now if the receiuer cometh thoroughly well prepared with great humility, charity, and attention, he then ouer and besides the ordinary grace of the Sacrament, shall receiue more grace according vnto the measure of his owne preparation.

Lastly, whereas we teach the very grace of justification to be giuen in foure Sacraments, as in Baptisme and Penance, M. P. R. saith no, because *A man of yeares must first beleue, and be justified, before he can be a meete partaker of any Sacrament.* But vvhath vwill he then say vnto Infants? must not they receiue the grace of justification by Baptisme, before they haue wit to beleue, and to reason in such sort as he prescribeth?

Lib. 2. de
Sacram.
in gener.
cap. 11.

Before I come vnto the arguments of either party, I thought fit to giue the reader to vnderstand, that whether the Sacraments be true physicall instruments of grace or no, is not a matter of faith; as Cardinal Bellarmine declareth, so we hold them to be true morall causes of the same grace: to which M. P. R. yielded his consent; wherefore I will not be long in this question. Secondly to perceiue well the state of the question, you must obserue what difference there is betweene a physicall and morall instrument. That then may be called a *morall instrument*, vvhich moueth the principall agent to doo any thing; albeit he vse not that thing it selfe as a meane to doe it vvit hall: so that if God be effectually moued to bestowe grace vpon him that receiueh a Sacrament, by the sight of the Sacrament; though he giue not the grace by the worke of the Sacrament, but immediately from him selfe, the Sacrament is the morall meane of the same grace; but it cannot be called the *physicall* or *naturall instrument* of that grace; vnielie God doe vse and apply the Sacrament it selfe, as the meane and instrument to coueiy the same grace into the soule of the receiuer.

Nowe,

OF THE SACRAMENTS.

Nowe, we hold it more agreeable with the word of God and testimony of the holy Fathers, and more for the dignity of the Sacraments themselves, to say that God by them as by true natural instruments, doth convey his graces into our soules: M. PERKINS goeth almost to prove the contrary, thus.

The word preached, and the Sacraments doe differ in the manner of giving Christ unto vs, inasmuch as the word is borne by the eare, and the Sacraments by the eye: other wise, for the graine it selfe they differ not. Christ saying: This is the very word is eaten but once in life: and what can be said more of the Laverd supper? Augustine saith, that beleevers are partakers of the body and blood in baptism: so saith Hierome in Epistola. Next upon this it followeth, that since the word is done in the word preached, conferreth no grace; neither doth the word done in the Sacraments conferre grace.

Scem. ad Infant.

I answer that his owne full word must stand, wherein he saith, that the word preached doth by perswasion drawe vs unto grace and goodnesse; but the Sacraments as conduite-pipes, doe take and convey grace from Christes passion, and convey it into the soules of all them, who doe not stoppe up those diuine conduits by their owne default, and want of due preparation. To his idle and ill shapen conclusion I answer, that Christes body may be eaten two wayes: either really as in the blessed Sacrament; or else spiritually, by beleeuing in Christ and being incorporated into his mystical body: and in this second sort Infants in baptism, and all true beleevers doe eat the body of Christ. But howe this proueth that the word and the Sacraments doe giue grace after the same manner, is there any man that can tell?

His second reason: *I baptise you with water in repentance, but when I cometh after me shall baptise you with the holy Ghost and wash fire. Hence (saith M. PERKINS) it is manifest, that grace proceedeth not from any act of the Sacrament: for Iohn though he doe not disfigure himselfe and his action from Christ, and the action of the spirit; yet doth he distinguish them plainly in number, persons, and effect.*

*Matth. 3.
Ier. 11:*

Answer. He that can, let him pike some English out of this, and shewe howe it maketh for M. PERKINS. But to the purpose: I answer, that S. Iohn there doth put a playne difference betwene his owne baptisme, and the baptism of Christ, saying of his owne: *That it was the baptisme of water, not giuing the holy Ghost, as the baptism of Christ should doe, which also most of the Fathers both Greeke and Latin doe playnely testifie, and the wordes of the text doe evidently confirme the same.* Whence I reason thus: S. Iohns baptism was such an instrument and meanes of

Mat. 1. grace, as M. P. *PER.* describeth (for there was a promise of remission of finnes, to him that received it with faith and repentance;) yet was it nothing comparable vnto Christes baptism, which is nowe only vsed; therefore Christes baptism doth ouer and besides the representation of grace which was in S. Iohns baptism, effectually conuay the same grace of the holy Ghost into our soules, by the very applying of it to vs; so that this worthy argument of his, proceedeth wholly against himselfe.

1. Cor. 3. He goeth forward and saith, *That Paul who traungled of the Galatians,*
1. Cor. 3. *and begat them by the Gospell, saith of himselfe: that he is not anything, not only*
1. Cor. 3. *as he was a man, but as he was a faithfull Apostle, thereby excluding the whole*
1. Cor. 3. *euangelicall Ministry, from the least part of diuine operation or efficacy in con-*
1. Cor. 3. *ferring grace.*

Answer. This is nothing to the purpose; for S. Paul speaketh there of preaching the Gospell; and we treat here of ministering the Sacraments. Preaching (as hath beene said) doth not conferre grace of it selfe, but by perswasion; no more doth the preacher, and so may be said to be nothing in that worke of producing grace and faith in the hearer: but the Sacraments conferring grace, he that administred the Sacrament, doth really concur as an instrument of producing the same grace. Moreouer, such an instrument may be said to be nothing, because they themselves with all their endowments can doe nothing in that matter, vnlesse they be there vnto applyed and moued by the principall agent, which is God: as a penne, or other instrument be it neuer so good, can doe nothing of it selfe, and therefore may be said to be nothing.

M. P. *PARKINS* third reason: *The Angels, say the flesh of the Sonne of God*
hath not any quickning vertue from it selfe, but all his vertue is from the God-
head: none if there be no efficacy in the flesh of Christ, but from the God-head,
howe shall bodily actions about bodily elements conferre grace immediately?

Answer. This is tooo simple; for a base bodily thing may conuay grace immediately, as an instrument of God, when as the highest creature hath not power of it selfe to produce and conferre the same grace, as principall agent: as a meane subject by speciall commission and authority from the Prince, may haue power of life and death; which the greatest Peere in the realme hath not of his owne authority, without some priuiledge from the Prince.

Rom. 4. His fourth reason: *Paul standeth much vpon this, so prone that justification*
by faith is not conferred by the Sacraments; and gathereth it, because Abra-
ham was first justified, and after ward receiued circumcision, the signe and seale
of his righteousness. Nowe the generall condition of all Sacraments is one, and
the same: and that baptisme succedeth circumcision.

Answer.

Answer. He mistaketh greatly *S. Pauli* discourse, which is nothing lesse then that he saith, but to proue that neither by the obseruation of *Moyse* lawe, nor yet by the morall carriage of the *Gentils* men were to be saued, but by faith in *Christ*, and obedience vnto his Gospell. Yea, he is so farre off from denying justification to be transferred by the Sacraments, that in the same epistle he reacheth vs to be justified by baptism, saying: *We are buried together with Christ by baptism into death, that as he is risen againe from the dead, &c. so we may walke in newnesse of life.* Again, *Cap. 6. vers. 4.* if Baptisme be but a signe and seale of righteousnesse, how commeth the infant (that cannot for lacke of discretion beleue) to that righteousnes, whereof Baptisme is the seale? *Abraham* in deede was justified before he was circumcised, because he was aboue 70. yeares old before he heard of any circumcision; but thence it followeth not, that the infants (circumcised at eight dayes old) were justified before they were circumcised. And so it may be, that *Cornelius* the Italian Captayne was justified, before he heard a word of the Sacrament of baptism, but that is nothing to proue or disproue the ordinary vworking of the Sacraments; for before the lawefull publication of any lawe, no man is bound to obserue that lawe: so that *Abraham* before he had heard of circumcision, and *Cornelius* knowing nothing of Baptisme, were not bound to them, but had other meanes of justification according to Gods will; and afterward receiued those Sacraments in obedience to God, both in testimony of their former righteousnesse, and to increase the same grace. Hence it doth not followe, but that the ordinary vworking of both circumcision and baptism in infants, was and is, to purge them from originall sinne, and to poure the grace of justification into their soules. But let vs admit al to be true which he saith, yet this argument helpeth not the maine point which he is to proue, to wit; that the Sacraments doe not produce grace into our soules: for albeit they produced not the first justifying grace, as the Sacrament of the Altar and some others doe not; yet they may truly produce and worke in vs an encrease of Gods grace, and so be true physicall instrumentall causes of grace, according as the *Catholikes* hold. Consequently, you may iudge vwhat a pithy reason his fourth is, vvhich may be answered foure manner of wayes.

His fift is the iudgement of the Church. *Basil*: If there be any grace *De spiritu in the water, it is not from the nature of the water, but from the presence of sancto 35. the spirit.*

Could any man haue produced a vvittnesse to speake more formally against himselfe? *M. P. R.* holdeth, that there cometh no vertue from the water to sanctifie the soule: *S. Basil* (the fore-man of his quest) aver-

reth, that grace cometh from the water; and is in the water: marry, that grace the water hath not of his owne nature, but from the spirit of God there present.

In 14.
Esaie. His second author. Hierome saith: *Man giueth water, and God giueth the holy Ghost.*

This is true, but whether God giue that grace by the ministry of the man, and meanes of the Sacrament, S. Hierome in that place saith neither yea nor no; and therefore his testimony helpeth not M. P. R. cause.

Ad Occas-
ionem. But in his 83. Epistle he doth at large declare, what efficacy baptism and the water sanctified in Christ hath.

Tract. 80. *Augustine said, Water toucheth the body, and washeth the hart.*

in Iohann. Answer. His wordes are: *What great force and vertue is this of water, that it toucheth the body and cleanseth the hart?* can any thing be more cleare and forcible to ouerturne M. P. R. position, then to say that the water of baptism washeth and purifieth mans hart? this sentence scalded his lips, wherefore he would gladly shake and shife it off by another place of the

Tract. 6.
in epist. Iohannis. same Father, where S. Augustine teacheth, *That water sometimes signifye the gifts of the holy Ghost.* Be it so: what then doth it therefore signifye the holy Ghost in all places? or in that where he saith, *That it toucheth the*

body and washeth the soule? it cannot be: for he speaketh of that water, with which first the body is washed, and that is not the holy Ghost, but natural water. But at least in the other place he doth not say out altogether, as much as he did in the first. True, and who is he that treating often of one matter, that is very copious and large, but that sometime he handleth one point of it, sometimes another: here he discusseth one and the same thing more exactly, there more sleighly, as occasion serued: wherefore, it is no reason to say that in one place he said not so much of this matter, therefore when he spake more particularly of it in another, you must expound him by that place where he spake lesse of it. And thus much in answer vnto M. P. R. reasons.

* Ath. 22. Nowe to some fewe arguments for the Catholike party. He proposeth
vers. 17. one for vs, thus: *Remission of sinnes and saluation are ascribed to the Sacrament of baptism.* * *Be baptised and wash away thy sinnes:* * *Cleansing the Church,*
Ephes. 5. *by the lauer of water in the word of life.* * *He hath saved vs by the lauer of regeneration:* * *The grace of God was giuen to Timothy, by the imposition of handes.*
vers. 5. Which phrase of cleansing, and saving by the lauer or bath of water, importeth no lesse then that by water, as a true physcally instrument, that
* 2. Tim. 1. grace of God was conuayed into the soules of the baptised; which may
vers. 6. be confirmed by many the like places, as where it is said: * *Vnto a man*
* Ioh. 3. *be borne a new of water and the holy Ghost,* where our regeneration and new
vers. 5. birth

birth is ascribed vnto the working of water; which were all very vnproper speeches, if they did import no more, then that when water is applyed vnto vs, then doth God immediately from himselfe and not by any meanes of the water, sanctifie vs: so that first we haue the Scripture for vs in his proper naturie signification.

M. PERKINS answereth, That saluation is ascribed vnto the Sacraments as to the word of God, that is: as they are instruments to signifie, seale, and exhibite to the beleeuing minde the fore-said benefits, but indeede the proper instrument whereby saluation is apprehended, is faith. And Sacraments are but proof of faith, furthering saluation two wayes: First, because by their signification they helpe to nourish and preserve faith. Secondly, because they seale grace and saluation to vs; yea, God giueth grace and saluation vnto vs, when we see them well: so that we beleue the word of promise made as to the Sacrament, whereof they are seales. This his answer I haue put downe at large, that the iudicious reader may see, how many wordes he useth, to answer not one word to purpose, for here is indeede an explication of their owne doctrine, but not any reason, why we should not take the wordes of holy Scripture before all adged, according vnto the proper manner of the phrase, whereby they asigne water to be the reall meanes, and true instrument of our saluation: and this much of our first argument.

The second shall directly confute his answer, thus: If Sacraments doe worke like vnto the word of God preached, and only exhibite and seale vnto the beleeuing minde, the benefits by them promised; then he that cannot vnderstand such signes and promises, and hath not wit to conceiue and beleue them, can in no case receiue any such Sacrament well and worthily (as if the word were preached neuer so perfectly vnto one of no capacity or vnderstanding, it would worke nothing with him, by reason of his want of vnderstanding:) but the Sacrament of baptisme and some others, giuen vnto them who haue not sufficient wit and reason to vnderstand the meaning of it, as (for example) vnto infants; yet doe neuertheless worke their regeneration and saluation: therefore, it is most manifest and euident, that the Sacraments of their owne proper force, as the instruments of God doe worke our saluation; without the helpe of the receiuers faith. This is confirmed by the testimony of those auncient Fathers, who hold that one speciall cause why our Saviour would be baptised was, that by touching the water, he might giue it vertue to purge and cleanse vs from sinne: so witnesseth *S. Ambrose, Lib. 2. in Lucam 12.* *S. Gregory Nazianzene, Oratione in sancta lumina.* *Chrysostome, Hom. 25. in iohannem.* Venerable Bede, in *3. Lucae*. Againe, it is the common opinion of the auncient Doctours, that the Sacraments are conduites to

convey the merits of Christs passion into our soules; yea, are said to haue flowed out of Christs side opened on the Crosse: they therefore doubt not but that they had a spirituall vertue in them, to cleanse and sanctifie our mindes. But let vs heare some fewe of them in formall termes deliuering the same doctrine which we teach: you haue heard already *S. Basil* and *S. Augustine*, cited by Mr *PERKINS*.

Gregory Nyssene, speaking of *Arens* rodde, and such like thinges by
 • *Orat. de* which miracles were wrought, saith: • And all these thinges being without
Baptismo fence and life, yet hauing receiued vertue from God, were meanes of great miracles: enso, water being nothing but water, hauing receiued the heavenly blessing, doth carrie a man into a spirituall regeneration. And further, That as seedes are the cause of naturall generation: so water that is blessed, is the instrumentall cause of mans regeneration and illumination.

• *Hom. 35* *S. Chrysostome*. • That which is water is to the infant, that is water vnto the faithfull: for in water we are formed and made.

• *Lib. 2.* *S. Cyril of Alexandria*. • Euen as water being heated with fire, doth burne like fire it selfe: euen so, water when with the body is sprinkled in baptisme, by the working of the holy Ghost is reformed, and raysed vp to a diuine power and vertue.

• *Lib. de* *Tertullian*. • Of old, water gaue life, that is, water brought forth liuing creatures: but it is no strange, that water in baptisme knowe howe to giue life.

• *Lib. 2. de* *S. Ambrose*. • It seemed impossible that water should wash away sinne: and *Naaman* the Syrian did not beleue that his leprosie could be washed away with water, but God hath made possible, that which was impossible, who hath bestowed so great grace vpon vs.

• *Lib. 7.* *S. Siluester* (as *Nicophorus* hath recorded) speaketh thus of baptisme:
 • This water hauing receiued by the inuocation of the blessed Trinity, becometh vertue: euen as it washeth the body without: so doth it within cleanse the soule from filth and corruption, and make it brighter then the Sunne-beames. So that it is most conformable both vnto the holy Scriptures, and the ancient Fathers, to affirme and hold, that the Sacraments do really contayne and convey the graces of God into our soules, as his true and proper instruments.



M. PERKINS Page 305.

Here followeth a Chapter, which for the most part doth nothing but reapeare points of doctrine, which hath bene particularly handled in the questions of Iustification, Satisfaction, and Merits, and about twenty times touched by the way in his booke; therefore a tedious and loathsome thing it is to me here againe to heare of them: yet, because the man thinketh that in these points the principall glory of the newe Gospell consisteth, and that therefore they are alwayes to be inculcated in season and out of season, I will briefly runne them once more ouer, shewing (as he doth) only vvherein we differ, without repeating the arguments, which are to be seene in their proper places.

To come to the matter he putteth downe five conclusions. The first conclusion. *The Catholikes teach it to be the property of faith to beleue the whole word of God, and especially the redemption of mankind by Christ.*

M. PERKINS DIFFERENCE.

They beleue indeede all the written word of God, and more then all: for they beleue the bookes Apocryphall, and vvvritten Traditions.

Answer. Touching vvvritten Traditions, see that Chapter in the first part. M. PER. saith here, *Because they come to vs by the handes of men, they cannot come within the compasse of our faith.* Then I say vpon the same ground; the vvvritten word cannot come within the compasse of our beleefe, because it also cometh vnto vs by the handes of men. And as the Apostles and their Schollers are to be credited, when they deliuered the vvvritten word vnto vs for Gods pure word: so are they to be beleued, vvhether they taught the Church these poynts of Gods word vvvritten, to be embraced as the true word of God, although not written, but committed to the hartes of the faithfull. And when we haue the testimony of auncient Councils, or of many holy Fathers, that these points of doctrine were by Tradition deliuered vnto the Church by the Apostles; vve as firmly beleue them, as if they were written in the holy Scriptures. For which bookes of Scripture be Canonically, vvhich not; and what is the true meaning of hard places in Scripture, we knowe no other way of infallible certainty, then by the declaration of the Catholike Church: which we therefore aswell beleue, telling vs these thinges were deliuered from
the

*Council.
Cantag. 3.
cap. 47.*

the Apostles by Tradition, as those things in writing. And that such credit is to be given to the *Catholicke* Church, the Apostles Creede witnesseth; which biddeth vs *beloeue the Catholicke Church*. Nowe touching those bookes of holy Scripture, which were some hundred yeares after Christ doubted off by some of the auncient Fathers, whether they were Canonically or no, thus we say: That albeit it were vndermined by the Church vntill *S. Augustines* time, whether they were Canonically or no, and so were by diuers auncient Fathers, though not condemned as Apocryphall, yet not comprehended within the Canon of allured Scriptures: notwithstanding, that matter being in a Councell holden at *Carthage* (where among many other learned Bishops *S. Augustine* was present) thoroughly debated, those bookes doubted off before, were found by the holy Ghost and them, to be true Canonically Scripture; and afterward were by the sixth generall Councell (that confirmed this Councell holden at *Carthage*) declared and deliuered to the whole Church for Canonically. Nowe, as we receiued at the first the other bookes of Canonically Scripture, on the credit of the *Catholicke* Church: euen so ought we to doe these, the haue declared them to be such; yea, the *Protestants* themselves haue admitted many bookes of the newe Testament, which were doubted off for three hundred yeares after Christ: why then doe they not as well receiue them of the old? The difference betwixt vs is, that they only of passion and private fancy admit these, and reject those: whereas we of obedience relying vpon the judgement of the whole Church, admit those bookes for Canonically, which the *Catholicke* Church hath declared for such. And thus much of the first conclusion.

Nowe to the second, *touching saluation by Christ alone*, wherein the *Protestants* either cannot vnderstand, or will not report our doctrine aright. We confesse that Christ has vs hath merited the redemption and saluation of all mankind: yet say we further, that nor one man is saved through Christ, vnlesse he for his owne part first beleeue in Christ, if he be of yeares, and be content to doe all those things that Christ hath commanded vs to doe: so that to saluation two things are required, the first and principall is Christes mediation, the second is the applying of Christes mediation and merits vnto vs, without this latter, the former will stand no man in steede. Nowe to be made partaker of Christs merits, we must not only beleeue in him as the *Protestants* teach, but also keepe his commandments, and by good workes deserue heauen; otherwise according to Christs decree, we shall neuer come thither, as in the question of Merits hath bene plentifully proved out of the holy scriptures: so we teach then, that besides Christs sufferings and merits we must haue some of our
owne,

owne; or else vve shall neuer be partakers of Christes

And M. PERKINS cannot be excused from a vvilfull corruption of Gods word, when he affirmeth *S. Paul* to say; *We are not saved by such workes as God hath ordaind men regenerated to walke in*: for those be not the wordes of the text, but his peeuih construction, *S. Paul* putting a playne distinction betweene *workes that we are not saved by*, and *workes that we must walke in*; calling these later *good workes*, and the other *barely workes*. To the other text I say, that we haue no righteousness of our owne strength; or by the vertue of *Moyse*s lawe; but through the mercy of God, and Christes merits, we haue true righteousness giuen vs by baptisme. Christ indeede by himselfe and his owne sufferings, not by sacrifice of Goates or Calues, hath meritoriously washed away our sinnes, that is: deserued of God that they should be washed away; but formally he hath washed away our sinnes by infusion of Christian righteousness into our soules. He that will see more of this, let him reade the question of Iustification. And whereas M. PERK. saith, that all grace of God powred into our hartes, is by the corruption of our hartes defiled; he little knoweth the vertue of Gods grace: which so cleanseth and purifieth our hart and soule, that it maketh it whiter then snowe, the temple of the holy Ghost, sanctified and apt to all good workes; as the word of God witnesseth.

The third conclusion is about *Christes imputatiue iustice*: vve hold that no man is formally justified by that iustice which is in Christ, which is infinite, and vould make vs as just as Christ himselfe is; but that God through Christes merits, doth bestowe vpon euery righteous man a certaine measure of iustice, vvhewith his soule being purged from sinne, and adorned with all honesty, fit for his degree and calling, is made righteous in Gods sight, and worthy of the Kingdome of heauen.

M. PERKINS holdeth, that *Every just man hath faith created in his hart*, whereby he layeth hand on Christes iustice, and drawing that to himselfe, maketh it his owne. He proueth it by these wordes of the Apostle: *Christ is made*

I answer, that Christ is in that place so made our righteousness, as he is made our wisdom: nowe no man holdeth that he is made our wisdom by imputation, therefore is he not our righteousness by imputation. The Apostles meaning is, that Christ is the procurer and meritorious cause of both our wisdom and iustice, and of whatsoeuer other spirituall gifts we enjoy. And this righteousness which God bestoweth on vs in this life, is sufficient to enable vs to keepe Gods lawe, (as I haue proued in severall questions before) and to make vs worthy of life euermlasting.

The fourth conclusion: *Catholikes hold it the surest course, to put their*

b j.

trust

Psal. 50.

1. Cor. 6.

2. Tim. 2.

vers. 21.

1. Cor. 1.

vers. 30.

trust in the mercy of God and merits of Christ for their saluation: yet in secret they may haue confidence both in their owne merittes, and in other good mens prayers.

That is, because God sancteth none of yeares, who doe not merit life euerm-lasting, by using his grace well: therefore a vertuous honest man may haue some confidence in the good course of his life. Marry, because we are not thoroughly assured of our owne good workes past, neither can we tell how long we shall perseuer in that Godly course of life: therefore, we rather stand in feare, when we consider our owne workes, and our whole confidence is in the mercies of God, vvho for Christes sake calleth most vnworthy creatures to his grace, and doth neuer forsake any endea- uouring to continue in his seruice. Neyther doth that visitation of the sicke in the Dutch tongue, found in a dusty corner, any whit helpe them: for we reach all (especially notorious sinners that vvalowe in sinne vntill their dying day, such as it seemeth that visite was made for) to trust, not in their owne naughtinesse or little goodnes, vvho haue a hundred times more euill then good in them; but in the infinite mercy of God and inestimable meritts of our Saviours death and passion: vvith which I set forth not but that a good man may haue some confidence in his owne meritts, and in the prayer of Saints. And M. P. R. considereth little what he saith, vvhen he affirmeth, *That we make that our God, in which we put our trust*: for albeit we must trust only in God, as in the author of all good thinges; yet may we trust in diuers other thinges, as in the meanes of our saluation. Doe not the Protestants trust in Christes passion? and yet I hope they made not his passion their God. Haue they not a confidence and trust in their liue- ly faith? yes, I varrant you, or else they would not be farre from despe- ration: so notwithstanding his vaine babling, *Catholikes* vvell grounded in vertue, may haue some confidence in their owne good deedes, and in the prayer of Saints, as orderly meanes to attayne vnto saluation, albeit we trust in God only, as in the authour of it.

The fift and last conclusion, *That we must not only beleene in generall, the promises of life euerm-lasting, but apply them to vs in particular by hope.* M. P. R. somewhat faintly excepteth against this, and saith: *That by faith we must assure our selues of our saluation present, and by hope continue the certaintie of it.* Marry, he addeth further, *That they teach not that every man liuing within the precincts of their Church, is certayne of his saluation by faith; but that be ought so to be, and must endeaour to attayne thereto.*

Why then, that man hath not the faith of Protestants, vvhich cannot but apply vnto themselves in particular the promises of life euerm-lasting; and that as the nature of faith requireth, without all staggering & doubt:
but

but to sowe pillows, and to lay them vnder poore deceiued mens el-
bowes he sometimes saith, that he requirerh not such certaintie of salua-
tion, yet in the conclusion of this very Chapter he forgetting himselfe so
quickly, saith: That we abolishe the substance of faith, namely in denying the
particular certayne application of Christ crucified, and his benefits vnto our selues.
A worthy author, that can no better agree with himselfe.

OF REPENTANCE.

OVR CONTEXT.

M. PERKINS Page 316.

THe first conclusion. Repentance is the conuersion of a sinner, which
is twofold, p^{er}sine and al^{ter}sine: p^{er}sine is an action of God, whereby he
conuerterh a sinner. Al^{ter}sine is an action whereby the sinner once tur-
ned by God, turneth himselfe and doth good workes, as the fruit there
of. of this later the question is.

The second conclusion. That repentance standeth specially for pra^{er}se, in
contrition of hart, confession of mouth, and satisfaction in worke or deede. There
be two sortes of contrition; one, when a man is sorrowfull for feare only of hell, and
other punishments in this life: this he calleth legall, though in the state of the
lawe there was most perfect contrition in some: The other Evangelicall,
when one is grieved for his sinnes, not so much for feare of hell, as because he hath
offended so good and mercysfull a God; which is alwayes necessary. Secondly,
we hold confession necessary to be made, first to God, then publickly to the congre-
gation, if any man be excommunicate for any crime. Thirdly, To our neighbour,
when we haue offended and wronged him. Lastly, In all true repentance there
must be satisfaction made: First to God, by intreating him to accept of Christes sa-
tisfaction for our sinnes. Secondly, to the Church for publicke offences, in humilia-
tion to testifie the truth of our repentance. Thirdly, satisfaction is to be made to
our neighbour, because if he be wronged, he must haue recompence and restitu-
tion made.

The third conclusion. That in repentance, we are to bring forth our ward
fruits, worthy amendment of life: whereof the principall is, to endeavour day
and night by Gods grace to leaue, and renounce al and euerie sinne, and in all thinges
to doe the will of God.

THE DIFFERENCE.

WE differ not from the Church of Rome in the doctrine of repentance itselfe, but in the abuses thereof: first in generall, because they beginne repentance part of the holy Ghost, and part of themselves, by the power of their free will helped by the holy Ghost; whereas Paul ascribeth it wholly unto God, proving
2. Tim. 2. vers. 15. if God at any time will give them repentance, &c.

Answer. Of this point hath bene spoken in the questions of Freevill, and of Iustification: and here M. PERKINS answereth and confuteth himselfe sufficiently, when he maketh as a *paſſive* repentance, by which God turneth our hartes to him; so an *active*, whereby a man first moued by God, turneth himselfe to God: so that by his owne doctrine, the free will of man helped by the holy Ghost, concurrerh to the first act of repentance. And where he saith, that the sinner was before dead, and therefore could not moue any part towardes repentance: we answer, that the grace of God rayſing him to repentance, doth quicken him and enable him to doe that good worke.

The second abuse of mistaking of penance, for the correction only of notorious offenders, is a fable.

The third abuse (saith M. PERKINS) is, that we make repentance not only a vertue, but also a Sacrament; whereas for a thousand yeares after Christ, it was not reckoned among the Sacraments. Thus, it seemeth that Lumbard our one of the first, that called it a Sacrament: and the Schoole-men after him disputed of the matter and forme of this Sacrament; not able any of them certainly to define, what should be the outward element of it.

Answer. I am sorry to see the man so carelesse of his credit: what doe schoole-men doubt of this Sacrament it selfe? or of either matter or forme of it? or are they not yet agreed what should be the outward element or visible signe of it? He needeth not feare to anouch any thing, that wil not blush at such a palpable vntruth: for not only the Councell of Trent, but long before it the Council of Florence, in the instruction of the *Ariminians* doth teach, the actes of the Penitent (to wit, contrition and confession) to be the element or materiall part of it; and the absolution of the Priest, the formall. The same about three hundred yeares past, taught the Prince of schoole-men S. Thomas of Aquine, Richard, Durand, and diuers others upon the fourth of the sentences, the fourteenth distinction, and now is the common opinion of all men: so that this was a lie in graine. No more truth hath the former part of his wordes: that Repentance for a thousand yeares after Christ, was not reckoned among the Sacraments. For Victor Cartonenſis who liued a thousand yeares past, doth in expresse

tearimes

greatest proue, that we must make much of the Sacrament of Penitence: *Lib. de*
 and most of the ancient Doctors, doe reckon and couple Penitence with *Penitentie*
 the Sacrament of Baptisme, or with the Sacrament of the Altar. To be- *cap. 20.*
 gime with the latter that we may ascend upward, Victor Vitensis bring-
 eth in the people speaking thus to the Priests, which were going into ba-
 ptism: Vnde vobis dicitur in baptismo quod est inquit et inquit et inquit et inquit *Lib. 2. de*
 et inquit et inquit et inquit et inquit et inquit et inquit et inquit et inquit *persecut.*
 et inquit et inquit et inquit et inquit et inquit et inquit et inquit et inquit *Vadalisca.*
 et inquit et inquit et inquit et inquit et inquit et inquit et inquit et inquit
 who shall be stone upon the gift of Penitence: and by the same of reconciliati-
 on: looke and vnderstand in the hands of sinners; but if ye go in it as in a ship,
 what sooner you shall be stone upon earth: shall be loosed in heaven. Is not Penitence
 here joynd with Baptisme: the very like hath St. Augustine; where he
 hath in the work vnder recourse in times of danger is worth to be made to the
 Church: some wanting to be baptized, others to be reconciled and to do Penitence, *Epist. 180*
 every one of them seeking comfort: and the administration of the Sacraments, *ad Honor.*
 where he not only reckoneth reconciliation, and Penitence with Baptisme,
 but such that they are Sacraments: for when the people seeketh after
 them, he saith: Thus they seek after the administration of Sacraments. And a
 little after: If ye be admitted on Priests to be present; some are baptized, some be re-
 conciled, none are debarred of the communion of our Lords body.

St. Hierome: Let him be redeemed by the blood of our Saviour, either in the *L. 1. cont.*
 house of Baptisme or in Penitence, that doth receive the grace of Baptisme. *Peleg.*
 St. Ambrose speaking against the Novatians, saith: why do ye baptize. *Lib. 1. de*
 if sinners may not be pardoned by a man: for in Baptisme there is remission of all *Penitentie*
 sinners: neither is it any matter, whether Priests by Penitence, or by Baptisme, doe *cap. 7.*
 challenge this right to be giuen unto them: for it is the same in both of the mysteries.
 So maneremitteth sinners as well in the mystery of Sacrament of Penitence,
 as in Baptisme, and the like vertue is in both by St. Ambrose judgement,
 these the one is a Sacrament as well as the other. And yet more then a
 100. yeares before him Tertullian saith: That God first setting the person and *Lib. de*
 infusion of sinne, and having shut vp the gate of pardon, and opened the doore of *Penitentie*
 baptisme, hath yet suffered something else to lie open: for he hath in the porch or
 portal placed the second penance, that may be opened to him that knocke; where
 here is the second Penance, that is, Penance after Baptisme, to be ap-
 pointed of God to take away sinne after baptisme, as baptisme did that
 which was before it: so that many worthy auncient Fathers doe reckon
 and account penance (or repentance as he calleth it) among the Sacra-
 ments of the Church; and so doe most manifestly confesse his shamelesse
 assertion.

But because I desire here at once to dispatch this matter; I will proue,
 that the Father of all Fathers (that is, Christ Iesus himselfe) hath institu-

red and delivered unto vs this Sacrament of Repence; viz. *When a man
by his Disobedience, he hath committed the heylfull and said that he is a
sinner, he is bound to ask, should he be returned in his sin. Whence we prove
that as there should be sinners in the Church; so then induced with power
to absolve them from their sinne; and because they are not to absolve any
that desire not to be absolved; the party must in humble sort request ab-
solution; and declare from what sinne he desireth to be absolved; for
what wise man will absolve one from he cannot tell what, and not know-
ing whether any resurrection be to be made or no. Wherefore, the party
humbly confessing his fault, and the Priest absolving of him in a religious
manner; thereby to magnifie God by the due dispensation of his gifts be-
flowed on man; there must needs be a visible signe of gract of justifica-
tion; which is at the same time conferred: so that even after the dedica-
tion of the Priests, it is a true Sacrament; for there is a religious cere-
mony instituted by Christ, that hath a promise of justifying grace an-
nexed thereto. And consequently so vide is that from truth; that within
thousand years after Christes repentance was not accounted a Sacrament;
that even in Christes owne dayes; and by himselfe it was instituted a Sa-
crament.*

*M. PARRAS objecteth for vs. It will be said that remission of sinne,
and life everlasting are promised to repentance; and as it is said that it is the
merit of repentance, that is the person which repenteth and that not for his
merit of repentance, but for the merits of Christ applied unto him by faith.*
Ans. When there is no mention made of faith, but only of repen-
tance, to attribute all to faith and nothing to repentance, is a very extraor-
dinary gloss; specially he doing it of his owne authority, without warrant
either by reason or of any authority; and that much of the abuses (for-
sooth) of repentance in generall. Nowe to the particular, about Con-
trition, Confession, and Satisfaction.

*The first abuse concerning contrition is, that the Catholikes teach that it must
be sufficient and perfect: they say to helpe the matter by a distinction. &c.*
Or remarkable abuse, that Catholikes would have contrition to be suf-
ficient and perfect. If we would have had it imperfect; and not ser-
vice the turne, then loe we had hit the sayle on the head: what damage
is this we say briefly concerning sorrowe for our sinnes past; first, that
it ought to be the greatest that we can have; for nothing is worthy to be
so vehemently lamented. As that we have deadly offended our creator
and redeemer, and are fallen from his grace, into the slavery of our most
deadly enemy the Devils; so that for this, as for the greatest evill that
could befall vs, we are to be most sorrowfull. And this is the greatest
sorrowe

sorrowe is requisite in contrition, which whereby alone we doe recover the grace of God aboue when Contrition is ioyned with Confession, and is made a part of the Sacrament, then loe though it were not so great before as is otherwise requisite, in recovery by vertue of participating with Christs grace in that Sacrament, the full measure of sorrowe, and so is made up sufficient and perfect, vvhich M. P. doth callen the first abuse of Contrition, but goeth not about to disprove it.

*The second, (as he saith) is, that we ascribe to Contrition, the merit of con-
gruity;*

Before he liked not to say that we made repentance the meritorious cause of remission of finnes; vvhich vvas a loude lie, because we teach that no man can merit remission of his finnes: for no man can merit ought at Gods handes, vnlesse he first be in his grace and fauour, vvhich no sinner is: yvherefore we hold only, that repentance as faith, hope, and a purpose of amendment, be only good dispositions, making the man fit and apt to receiue the grace of justification, vvhich God freely of his infinite mercy without any desert of ours, bestoweth vpon vs only for Christs sake. That apt disposition, some men call merit of congruity, vvherein is no desert of the grace giuen, but only a man is made thereby more meete and better prepared to receiue such grace. Nowe mans merits doe so vvell agree and stand vvvith Christs merits, that Christs order is, that none comming to the age of discretion, shall be partaker of his merits, vnlesse he by his owne merit, doe make himselfe capable of them, as hath bene sufficiently proued before in the question of Me-
rits.

The third abuse, That they make imperfect contrition or attrition arising of the feare of hell, to be good and profitable, and so it they apply the saying of the Prophet, The feare of God is the beginning of wisdom. But (saith he) seruile feare of it selfe, is the way to eternall destruction, &c.

Reply. He vnderstandeth not what we say: we teach, that feare of being punished in hell fire, maketh euill men abstaine from sinning, and be-
ginneeth to put them in minde of Gods iustice towardes impenitent sin-
ners; vvhewewith many being strooken vvvith the horrow of that euil last-
ing torment, are moued to flie vnto God for mercy: and so that seruile
feare becommeth profitable vnto them; first in that it causeth them to ab-
staine from that vvvickednesse, vvhich they vvvould otherwise haue com-
mitted, and then being helped with Gods grace, they beginne to turne
vnto his mercy: and so feare of Gods punishments becometh vnto them
the beginning of wisdom: Thus much in effect doth M. P. say himselfe al-
lowe of, and yet vvvould seeme to confute it, his judgement is so slender:

Nowe

Now to the abuses concerning Confession.

The first abuse, *That we confess our sinnes to God in an vnknown language.*

What, is there any language vnknowne to God? or doth he meane, that the vnlearned make their confession in Latin, which is impossible for a man that vnderstandeth not one Latin word? He would say (rightly) that some of them begin their generall confession in Latin; but we speake here of every mans confession in particular: that general of the Churches ordinance, is commanded only to be vsed of them that are skilfull in the Latin tongue; all others may vs the English. *What (saith he) we require the aide and intercession of dead men.* We beleue the Saints to be liuing, which if he doth not he blasphemeth. Touching the intercession of Saints I haue treated before. Now as we request the helpe of their prayers, so doe we acknowledge vnto them howe grievously vve haue offended, that they seeing our humillity and sorrowe for our sinnes, may the more earnestly entreate for the redemption of them. But let vs come vnto the principall point in controuersie about this matter, viz. *That we haue vnchristen Canonick confession; by turning it into a priuate particular confession, binding all men to confesse all their mortall sinnes, with the circumstances that charge the kind of the sinne (as farre as they can remember) vnto every yeare at the least; and that to a Priest, vntill it be in the case of extreme necessity.* But in the word of God there is no warrant for this confession, nor in the writings of orthodox antiquity for the space of many hundred yeeres after Christ; as one of their owne side acknowledgeth: and he quoteth in the margin a man of small credit among vs *Beatus Rhenanus*, for his authour. Well let vs see a little, what warrant we haue in holy Scriptures and in the ancient Doctors, for confession of our sinnes vnto a Priest.

Job. 20.

vers. 23.

First it is evidently collected out of these wordes of our Saviour: *Receive the holy Ghost, whose sinnes ye doe forgive in earth, they shall be forgiven in heauen, and whose sinnes ye doe retayne, they shall be retayned.* For giuing his Apostles power to reue and forgive men their sinnes, his meaning was not that they should pardon them whether they would or would not, or that they should absolute any other then such as were contrite, and did humbly craue absolution: neyther should they absolute them from they knewenot of what, but that they should knowe what, howe many and howe grievous their offences were, that they might be put to worthy penance, and receive particular comfort and counsell for the amendment of their liues, or else they should be the most foolish iudges; that euer were appointed vpon earth. Wherefore, seeing that the Apostles had authority to forgive sinnes, and were in discretion to admmister the same vnto

penitent

penitent sinners; it most needes followe necessarily, that the penitent should confesse all his sinnes in particular vnto them: and that authority was to continue in the Church for ever; it being giuen to the Apostles for the due governing of the Church, and to the comfort of all sinners; which should neuer sayle to be vntill Christes last comming to iudgement. They to defeat all this discourse; answer: *That Christ gave not his Apostles authority to pardon any man sinnes; but only to declare that their sinnes were pardoned, if with true repentance and faith they received the preaching of the Gospell.* This interpretation first is repugnant to the text, which in expresse termes hath, *Whose sinnes yee shall remit or pardon; not whose sinnes yee shall declare to be remitted.* Secondly it hath, that *Whose sinnes yee shall forgive, they are forgiven,* to wit: euen then, when they remit them; and not that they were remitted before; as he should haue said; if he had giuen them authority only to declare them to be remitted. Thirdly, the metaphor of keyes giuen vnto them; doth demonstrate that power was giuen them to absolve, and not to declare only they were absolved; because keyes are giuen to open or shut doores, and not to signify that they either the doores are already open, or shall be vpon condition. Lastly the Ministers pronouncing of men absolved, should be very rash and frivolous if they do not truly absolve them. For if he pronounce them absolutely to be absolved without good assurance of their faith & repentance, he should but lie; and if he doe pronounce them absolved conditionally if they be cleare right and be truly penitent; then verely his absolution is vaine; for it depending vpon their faith and repentance; and not vpon the Ministers pronouncing it bringeth no further assurance then they had before: yea, they themselves being of the faithfull, could not be ignorant of so much before, to wit, that he was free from sinne; and needed not his absolution. Nowe that the Apostles then, and Bishops, and Priests their successors euer since, did truly absolve men from their sinnes, and were not (like to cryers) only proclaymers thereof, see first *S. Chrysostome*, who saith: *That such power was giuen here to men, which God would neuer giue to Angels.* who yet had power to pronounce saluation to penitent sinners. Secondly, *That Priests haue such power of binding and loosing vnder the foules,* as *Kingdome haue ouer their subjects bodies;* which is truly to binde or to loose them, and not only to declare them bound or loosed. Thirdly, he saith expressely: *That the Priests among the Iewes had power to purge the leprosie, or rather to try whether they were purged from it or no; but it is granted vnto our Priests, not only to discerne whether the body be purged from leprosie or no, but playnely to purge our soules from the filth of sinne.*

S. Ambrose in diuers places proueth directly against the *Nouatians*, that

- Lib. 1. de *Christe gaudere* to Priests to receive sinners. The Novatians denied not but
 Penitent. that one might preach the Gospel vnto such sinners that were christened,
 c. 2. & 7. and punithe them pardon too if they repented. But would not haue the
 Priests to reconcile them vnto the Church by the Sacrament of Penance;
 denying that Priests had any such power ouer such sinners, but that they
 must leaue them to God alone: vvhich the holy. Doctour confuteth by
 these places of Scripture, *Math. 16. vers. 19. & cap. 18. vers. 18.* *Ioh. 20.*
vers. 23. *What soauer wee forgive in earth, shall be forgiven in heauen.*
 Epist. ad *S. Hierome* saith: God forbidde; that I should stroke any smil of idem; who
 Heliodor. succeeding in the Apostolike degree, doe with their sacred mouth make the body of
 Christ, and by whome we are made Christians: who having the keyes of the Kingdome
 of heauen, doe for a tennaine to ouer iudge before the day of iudgement.
 Lib. 20. de *S. Augustin* doth define in these wordes, *What soeuer ye shall binde vpon*
 ciuit. 6. 9. *earth, shall be bound in heauen*; that authoritie is giuen vnto the rulers of the Church
 to iudge in spirittuall causes, and not only to declare: it is to iudge, & to
 Hom. 62. *S. Gregory* vpon these wordes, *What soeuer ye shall forgive, &c.* Behold
 in Euang. *(saith he)* the Apostles are not only made free of themselves, but haue power gi-
 uen them to loose or to bind others: and doe aunciently a prerogative of the beaue
 ly iudgement; that is God, steeleth by many forgive to some their sinnes, and binde
 some in heau: and truly the Bishopps doe hold the same place in the Church;
 they receiue authoritie to binde and to loose, &c. By this you may see in part
 vvhich was fore said. *M. P. R.* affirmed, that for a thousand yeares
 after Christ there was no mention of the Sacrament of Penance; and
 more you shall see shortly, if that first I shall note out of the Scripture it
 selfe, both the acknowledgement of receit of that power to reconcile
 and absolute; and the practise and commandment of confession. *S. Paul*
 2. Cor. 5. acknowledgeth and declareth; that God had giuen vnto them the minis-
 vers. 18. *try of reconciliation*; and addeth, that they be Gods *Legates*; and therefore ex-
 c. 20. *horteth them to be reconciled*; but they that be sent Ambassadors vvhich full
 commission to reconcile men vnto their Prince, must knowe both howe
 grievously they haue offended, and what recompence they are willing to
 make, vvhich must needes be by their owne confession. Nowe for the
 Alt. 19. practise of confession by the first Christians, it is recorded. *That many of*
 vers. 18. *the faithfull, came confessing*; and declaring their deedes: and many that had fol-
 c. 19. *lowed curious actes, brought their bookes and burned them in the presence of alab-*
ress. Note here both particular confession made vnto *S. Paul* of the seuer-
 rall deedes and fautes, and not in generall; that they were sinners as the
 very wordes doe witnesse, *Confessing their deedes*, that is, vvhich they had
 done in particular. And againe, howe should he haue knowne their sto-
 dy of curious bookes, if they had not told their sinnes in particular? some

Professours convinced by the text say, That they confessed some of their finnes in particular, but not all. But I enquire how they came by the knowledge of that: for why should they confesse some more then others? and the vse of Scriptures is, by the naming of finnes indefinitely, to signifie all; as when we pray, Forgive vs our finnes, we meane all our finnes: and when it is said of Christy He shall saue his people from their finnes, it is meant, that he shall saue them not from some of their finnes, but from all. Lastly, touching the commandement, S. Iames doth charge vs, To confesse our finnes one to another: vvhich ^a Origen, ^c S. Chrysostome, and ^d S. Augustine doe expound to be meane of particular confession to the Priest. And S. Bede vpon that place, saith in his sentenche, that discretion is to be vsed, that for dayly and light offences we may confesse vnto such our equals, whose prayer we trust to be helped: but the vncleannesse of the more grievous tyeper, we must (as it is in the lawe) lay open to the Priest, and according to his judgement we must endeavour to be purged, so much and so long time as he shall command.

Caluin saith, that S. Iames speaketh of such confession only, which euery one is to make vnto his brother, whome he hath offended, and confirmed it, because it followeth in the text: And praye for another. But that vvhich goeth before, of calling the Priest to the sick man to anoint him, doth rather argue, that it is spoken of confession to be made to the Priest, if the sick man remember any mortall finnes; for it is not enough to haue the Priest to pray for the sick, and to anoint him, if he haue been free of mortall finnes: vnlesse he first confesse himselfe of them, he cannot be absolved from them; nor vworthilie receiue Extreame Vnction. And as other such like places are expounded, as for example, Vse hospitality one towardes another; euery one as he hath receiued grace, ministering the same one to another: vvhich is not, see the poore vse of hospitality as well toward the rich, as the rich toward the poore; and the sick cure the physician as vvell as the physician to cure the sick. But vse of hospitality one toward another, that is, those that be vvell able, towardes them that haue neede: euen so confesse one to another, that is, he that hath sinned, to him that hath authority to absolve him. Nowe let vs heare howe ancient this confession is, and vvhether it vvere heard off for a thousand yeares after Christ.

S. Irenaeus, vvhoe liued in the next age after the Apostles, maketh mention of certayne noble Women, whome Heretikes had pittifully abused: and saith; That they coming to repentance made a confession of their faultes. Tertullian of the same age, reprehendeth some certayne, vvhoe more fearefull (as he speaketh) of their owne shame, then carefull of their saluation, put off their confession from day to day: whome he likens to them who had

a Luc. 5.

vers. 16.

b Hom. 2.

in Leuiti-

cum.

c L. 3. de

Sacramen-

t.

d Lib. 50.

Homiliar.

bone 12.

ad rom. 11.

87. dia. 5.

87. dia. 5.

87. dia. 5.

87. dia. 5.

87. dia. 5.

87. dia. 5.

87. dia. 5.

87. dia. 5.

87. dia. 5.

87. dia. 5.

87. dia. 5.

87. dia. 5.

87. dia. 5.

87. dia. 5.

87. dia. 5.

87. dia. 5.

87. dia. 5.

87. dia. 5.

87. dia. 5.

87. dia. 5.

87. dia. 5.

87. dia. 5.

87. dia. 5.

87. dia. 5.

87. dia. 5.

diseases in their secret partes, and fearing to discover thym to the physician, doe through their owne shamesfastnesse perishe. And in the end of the booke he saith: That this confession of faultes was appointed by our Lord himselfe.

Homil. 2. Origen. There is also a frequent remission of finnes, though hard and laborious, which is by penance: when the sinner doth wash his head with his teares, and when he is not ashamed to confesse his sinne to the Priest of our Lord, and so seeks remedy, &c.

Lib. 3. Epist. 16. S. Cyprian. When in lesser offences penance is to be done a just time, and confession is to be made; his life being looked into who doth the penance, neither can he be admitted to come to the communion, before the Bishop or Clergy have laid their hands upon him, shew much more in these most grievous and exceeding great crimes, must all things be maxie and severely observed, according unto our Lordes order and discipline: Againe, Of how much greater faith and better fear are they, who though they be not entangled with any crime of sacrifice or libell, yet because they thought of those offences, doe simply and sorrowfully confesse them selves guilty of those things unto the Priest of God.

Serm. in illa verba. S. Ambrose. Upon these wordes (Going into a Village ye shall finde a Colt yed) saith: Let us examine our selves, whether the fetters of our finnes be loosed, that we may amend our lives; and if they be not yet loosed, let us present our selves unto the Disciples of IESVS. For they are present, that by authority which they have received from our Saviour can loose you: for he said, Whatso ever ye binde vpon earth, shall be bound in heaven: and whatso ever ye loose on earth, shall be loosed in heaven. And whose finnes ye forgive, they are forgiven.

Regula. 228. S. Basil. Of necessity must we confesse our finnes to them, unto whom the dispensation of the mysteries of God is committed, that is to Priests.

Oratione in muliere peccatrice. S. Gregory Nyssene. Doe thou confidently open to the Priest thy faultes, discover the secrets of thy hart, (as priuy wounds) unto the physician; and he will have care both of thy honour, and of thy health.

S. Ambrose when he did heare men that came to him to receive penance, and to confesse their faultes, as very many came to him therefore, he did so weeper that he constrained them also to weepe, as witnesseth holy Paulinus in his life.

In cap. 10. Ecclesiast. S. Hierome. If that serpent the Devill have bitten any man secretly, and have venimed him without the privity of any man; if be that was strooken hold his peace and doe not penance, nor will confesse his wound unto his Brother and Master, his Master that hath a tongue to cure and heale him, cannot easily helpe him: for if he that is sicke be ashamed to shew his wound unto the physician, physike cannot cure that which it knoweth not. And vpon the 16. of S. Mathew he specifieth those Masters that had tongues to heale, saying: So bere the

Bishop

Bishop and Priestes doe not bind or loose, who according to their office haue heard the variety of sinne, dark knowe who is to be bound, and who is to be absolved.

S. Augustine. Be sorrowfull before confession, but when thou hast confessed In psal. leape for joy, even when thou shalt be cured: the conscience of him that doth not 66.
goe to confession; hath gathered together corrupt matter, an impostume is swelled out, it vexeth him and giueth him no rest; the Physicians apply the lenities of wordes, and sometimes lance him. See. Doe thou put thy selfe into the handes of the Physicion, confesse and let all that corrupt matter issue forth in confession, and then rejoyce and be gladd, for therest shall afterward be easily cured. That Priestes be these Physicions of soules he teacheth, Lib. 50. bomiliarum, bom. 12. Item tract. 49. super Iohan. Con. 2. in Psal. 101. Tract. 22. in Iohan. 7. bom. 49. Lib. 50. bom. Doe penance such as is done in the Church of God; let no man say, I doe penance secretly, I doe it to God, God knoweth that I doe it who doth pardon it: To whome he replyeth thus: Then in vayne was it said, whatsoeuer ye loose in earth, shall be loosed in heauen: Therefore, to no purpose were the keyes of heauen giuen to the Church; we make frustrate the Gospel of God, we make voyde the wordes of Christ; finally, we promise to our selues that which he denyeth vs, &c. See howe playnely and formally he (to many hundred yeares before) hath confuted the Protestants shoe-anke, and only refuge of confessing their sinnes to God alone; and assureth vs, that it is a most vayne excuse; and will not serue any mans turne; when as God himselfe hath set downe and decreed, that he will pardon no man of his sinnes, vvho doth nor seeke absolution thereof from them to whome he hath committed the charge of that matter, that is from Priestes. And in right reason, can there be any better bridle vnto our corrupt nature; then the very shame and bashfulness of confessing our secret fautes vnto a learned, good, and graue man; such as a Confessor is or should be. Again, where true confession of sinnes is, there men vse the best meanes that can be, to driue them from the custome of sinning: for besides the particular sorrow which they haue of their sinnes, they must firmly purpose neuer to returne to any kinde of sinne afterward; yea; they must abstayne from all occasions alluring to sinne: so that no man (vsing wel this Sacrament of Confession) can dwell in malice, vsury, leachery; or any state of sinne. Moreouer, if they haue taken away the goodes or good name of their neighbour, they are enjoyned in confession presently to doe that which is lost restore it backe againe. These and many other great commodities being the inseperable companions of priuate Confession, vve Catholike doe attribute vnto the good vse thereof, the greatest Goodnes and deuotion that is amongst vs. And no maruaile, though our common

enemy doe so busily endeavour to withdrawe sinners from it, simplifying voto themselves dignity and shame of it, but if they would consider maturely, that dying in their sinnes for lacke of due confession, they shal be (to their utter shame and confusion) made to confesse them all and every one at the latter day, before God, all his Angels and Saints, the Devill and all damned soules being also present; they would undoubtedly make choice, rather to confesse their sinnes to some one vertuous Priest, vvho will never reueale them, but in Christes name absolute and pardon them; then to leaue them to that dreadfull day of Gods just judgements, when besides the shame and confusion of them, no pardon is to be hoped for. And thus much touching Confession.

Lastly (saith M. PERKINS) *The abuse of satisfaction is, that they haue turned Canoniall satisfaction, which was made as the congregation by open offenders, into a satisfaction of the iustice of God, for the temporall punishment of their sinnes. Behold here a most horrible pervertion of the whole Gospell.*

Answer. Behold here a most vngodly and senselesse outcrye; wherewith the whole sanctity of the Gospell consisteth only in the point of our satisfaction: it is too absurd to say. And howe knoweth he, that Canoniall satisfaction was only or principally to satisfie the congregation? They that ordained of old those Canons of satisfaction, had a greater care to satisfie and appease the wrath of God justly incensed against such wicked offenders; then to satisfie men: but this prophane man very fondly dreameth, that they rather sought to please men then God. But of this matter there is a whole question in the former part: there he that will may see, howe all satisfactions are principally instituted to appease Gods wrath; and that they doe apply vnto vs the satisfactions of Christ; and make us partakers of them; and are besides most convenient meanes to build out corruption from all sorts of sinnes.

M. PERKINS shewes that he vvast the same man in the end of his booke, as in the beginning; concludeth this part with a most palpable lie, to wit, *That Priests are not put to death in England for their religion; but for their treason; which is true and neede no dispute.* Let their owne record be seene, whether very many of them haue not bene condemned, only because they are Priests, made after the auncient Roman manner, without laying vnto their charge any enterprise, eyther against the person of the Prince, or peace of the State. But what wil not a Minister aouche to disgrace poore Priests, vvho doe neuertheless not only pray, but will be ready also to spend their blood for the conuiction of men of his fore; and for all others their deare country-men, by them most pittreously seduced.

Hitherto M. PERKINS hath handled pointes of religion, something

like

like a school-man; now like a pulpit-minister he goeth on with his text, and maketh such an unsundry glasse vpon it, that it loothes me almost to holcon in: yet because he raketh and heapeth together all the most odious matter that he can deuise against vs, I will giue it the whippe, and ha- stily runne ouer it: thus he beginneth.

Secondly out of the same text (Go out of her my people) I gather, that the true Church of God is, and hath beene in this present Roman Church, as the same is in the booke of Eusebius. For though Popery once spread the fire of the carst for many hundred yeares, yet, in the middle thereof, God reserved a people to him- selfe; that truly worshipp him, &c. And this will serue the turne to stoppe the mouth of Papists, who demand of vs where our Church was in the year 451. againe, before the dayes of Luther? we answer, that it was in the year 451, as our Church hath bene since the dayes of the Apostles; and that in the very middle of the Popes; but it first beganne to shewe it selfe in Luthers time, on which full Ap- pointment hauing builded it before for many hundred yeares.

Answer. Here is a proper peece of doctrine, and proved as profounde. It is very ridiculous and absurd to say, that this Church was in the Church of Rome; for one that will be both of their Church & of the Roman, must beleue and professe not one or two, but more then twenty articles that contradictorie the one to the other, which is impossible. Can a man anon beleeue the Pope to be head of the vniuersal Church, and with all sweare that he hath no authoritie in many Princi- ples of it; but that all Ecclesiasticall iurisdiction there belongeth to the Princes; or that Christs nat- ural body, is really present in the Sacrament; and not really present; and that Saints are to be prayed vnto, and not to be prayed vnto: nothing is more euident, then that this cannot be: no more could the Protestants Church be in the Church of Rome. And if the Protestants would allowe them for theirs; who beleeue most of the articles of the Roman faith con- trary to their owne doctrine, so that in some fewe points they doe agree and accord with them: yet the Church of Rome will neuer take them for any of their children; who doe not wholly and inuolably hold all the points of faith that the Protestants do professeth, but renounce them; and declare them to be accursed; wherefore, no Protestants can be in the Church of Rome. But they say, That their Church lay hidde in the Roman, as corn in chaffe. Did it in deed lie in such obscurity, that none of them were to be seene or heard off: therefore it was no Church at all: for the most proper markes of the Church (according to their owne principles) are, The true preaching of Gods word; and the sincere administration of the Sacraments. Nowe, preachers of the vword must be both seene and heard also; and they walked not inuisible (I hope) vvhio ministred and receiued their Sacraments: wherefore,

Pag. 331.

of the

of the

of the

of the

of the

of the

of the

of the

wherefore, they must either graunt that their Church in that generall Ap-
 postacy was visible, or that it was no Church at all, as not having the inse-
 parable markes of their Church, which are, *The true preaching of the word,*
 and *due administration of the Sacraments*. Again, if they had beene liuely
 members of the true Church, how could they liue vnknowne in that great
 Apostacy? were they not bound in conscience, to haue made profession
 of their faith publicly? *S. Paul* saith yea: *With the hart we beleene thee iud*
Rom. 10. *lice, but with the mouth confession is made to saluation.* And our Saviour saith
Math. 10. *He that shall deny me before men, I also will deny him, before my father which is*
vers. 33. *in heauen.* If they were such craven, as made more account of their owne
 ease and safety, then of the truth of their religion and glory of God; they
Math. 13. were rather *cockle*, ouer-sewed by the enemy among the good-seeds, then like
vers. 25. vnto come hidden in chaffe. In vaine for them also was that voyce sent
 from heauen, and recorded by *S. Iohn* (which *M. P. R.* taketh for his text)
Goe out of her my people; for these dastardly faint-hearted fellows, would
 giue no care to it, but loued better to hide their heades in some musty cor-
 ner, then with danger of their liues, to separate themselves from those
 abominations. If then there were any such false-hearted, dumbe, and
 deafe reprobates hidden among others, let the Protestants take them (if
 they please) for their worthy ancestors: But no reason in the world to call
 them the true Church of God, that had neither true loue of Gods honour
 nor of their neighbours good and conuersion, otherwise, they would not
 haue holden their peace, seeing Gods holy name so miserably prophand;
 as they thought. Thus much of *M. P. R.* position: now to his proofe.

If any man aske them where their Church was before Luthers dayes, he answereth
out of this text, (Goe out of her my people;) that it was euer since the
apostles dayes.

Let vs drawethis to some forme of argument, that it may appeare how
 it hangeth together: A voice from heauen cryed in *S. Iohn*'s dayes to the
 Church of Rome: *Goe out of Babilon*, that is; depart from the congregati-
 on of the wicked Heathens and Pagans: therefore the Protestants religion,
 hath beene euer since the Apostles dayes. Apply *Iohn Barber*, and thou
 shalt haue a newe paire of sizors for thy labour. Should not a man leaue
 his labour to confute particularly such a sencelesse discourse? But yett
 word to his next annotation vpon the text: *Demanding whether the Church*
of Rome, be a Church or no? he answereth, *That (if it be so taken as in truth it*
is) is no Church at all. His proofes are, *That it is Babilon, that it peruerterh*
the true sense of the Scripture, and ouerturneth the inward baptisme: all which I
 haue heretofore confuted. Here I will but demand, whether this asserti-
 on of his doth not yndermine and blowe vp his former? for if their hid-

den Church were no where but in the Roman, for nine hundred yeares together, and that Roman were no Church at all; then surely their Church was not at all, which had no being and existence but in the other, which vvas not at all. I may not here omit to note by the vway vnto the gentle reader out of S. Augustine, Howe they robbe Christ of his glory and inheritance bought with his pretious blood, who hold that his Church failed, and was fled into corners. Yea, S. Hierome further affirmeth, That they make God subject to the Deuill, and a poore miserable Christ, who hold that his body the Church may perish, or be so bidden that it cannot be heard off.

In illa ver
ba, p. 85.

TV SO-
LVS DE-
VS MA-
GNVS.

pag. 338.

Wherefore, omitting such impertinent stuffe, let vs come vnto those horrible crimes that he chargeth the Church of Rome withall. The first is no lesse then *Atheisme*, to vvhich I haue fully answered in the preface of this booke, wherefore I doe omit it here, & doe come to the second crime of *Idolatry*, which (saith he) is as grosse among vs, as euen it was among the Heathens. See the foule mouth of a preacher: howe proueth he this? *Idolatry* is to be seene in two things: first, by worshiping the Saints with religious worship, which is proper to God. O most impudent I doe we make Saints creators of heauen and earth, omnipotent, infinitely wise and good, or giue them any kinde of honour due vnto God only? see that question, and detest the sonnes of the Deuill, that blust not to auouch such monstrous lies.

But we make the blessed Virgin Mary a Mediator of redemption.

Fie vpon such an impudent face: but we call her a Lady, a Queene: be it so. For so did Albanasus in Euang. de sanctiss. Virg. apply those wordes of the 44. Psalme, The Queene standeth on thy right hand; in a golden vestment, &c.

So did Gregory Nazanzene, in his Verses of her: For thou (saith he) O Queene, by the diuine fauour camest to me.

So did holy Effrem, in his Oration to her: all which liued within foure hundred yeares off Christ. To omie S. Chrysostomes Lyturgy, because they like it not. But what of this, shee is a redeemer? O fencelesse! that shee is called a Goddesse (as they did call the Queene Elizabeth then li- uing) I reade not in any of the bookes quoted by him. A mediatrix of intercession, our hope, our life, and the like, shee may be called in a good sence, because we hope through the helpe of her most gracious prayers to obayne the life of our soules: and so may it be said to her, Prepare thou glory for vs, defend vs from our enemies, and such like, to wit, by the meanes of her prayers. Again (saith he) their Idolatry is manifest, in that they worship God in, at, or before Images. Then are the Protestants also Idolaters, because they worship God, in, or at the Churches, at, or before their

Missal.
Bremiar.

communion table. Whether we have commandement or not for Images, maketh nothing to Idolatry; but whether we giue to Images the honour only due to God, which we doe not. Nowe to compare Images to adulterers, is to dote; and deserueth no answer.

Thirdly (saith he) their Idolatry passeth the Idolatry of the Heathens, in that they worship a breaden God, or Christ vnder the formes of bread and wine.

O impious Atheist, and also godher unworthy the name of a Christian! Is not Christ to be worshipped where soeuer he be; and that as wel vnder the formes of bread, as vnder the shape of a man? it is not the outward shape or shewe, that maketh Christ worthy of diuine worship: but the substance of his God-head there present though hidden. *But he is not there at all* saith he: which to be most false, I haue proued in that question.

The third sinne is the maintaynance of adultery, first in the tollerating of the stewes.

Answer. It is one thing to tollerate an euill, another thing to maintaine it. God doth tollerate many euils, but maintayneth none: so the stewes in some hotte Countreyes are tollerated, to auoide a greater mischiefe; yet not maintayned but disgraced and punished, and diuers meanes ysed to perswade them that liue so viciously, to leaue and detest that vicked kinde of life. As our state doth tollerate vsury, if it be vnder tenne in the hundreth: and yet we charge them not with maintaynance of vsury, but rather thinke it a polittike deuise, by tollerating the lesse euill to auoyde a greater. Again, this is a point of ciuill pollicy, and no part of the *Catholike* religion, which is in many Kingdomes wholly embraced, where there be no stewes tollerated. In some hotte Countreyes the ciuill Magistrate by experience findeth it better, to suffer some hot and incontinent lecherous companions to haue such a remedy, rather then to permit them to sollicite their Wiues and Daughters to vickednesse. I would to God that the wise saying of a most worthy Doctour were not fulfilled in our Countrey: *Take away the stewes, and fill all the City with adultery.* Is not the City of London vuell reformed (trowe you) by taking the stewes out of it? If the man had any fore-head, knowing howe their sweet Gospell hath infected both Court and Countrey vvith filthy and abhominable lechery, he would haue bene ashamed to reprehend them, who labour to breake the worser course of it, seeing they cannot extinguish it altogether.

He saith secondly, *That our lawe alloweth marriage beynd the fourth degree; and by this meanes incest: for Anne the Aunt of Nicholas may be married vnto the child of Nicholas a childes child, because shee is beyond the fourth degree.*

Behold the wisdom of this man: first vyharyeares shall *dyn* be off before

before that child of the fourth generation after *Nicholas* his Nephew, be marriageable; by that he be twenty yeares old, shee must be sixt score or there about, and so a very sic match for that youth. Againe, it is but a supposed imagination of a rawe head, that the Aunt is in steede of a Mother vnto all that descend of her Brother. These good fellows that finde faule with vs, for allowing marriage beyond the fourth degree, doer themselves maintayne it in the very second; for brother and sisters children may and doe often marry together among them: vvhich was prohibited in *S. Augustines* dayes as a deformity, euen against the naturall shamefastnesse ingrafted in so neare of kinne. And *Gregory* the great being de-
 wounded at the first conuersion of the *English* to the faith, his opinion in this matter, answereth thus: That although a certaine earlie lawe permitted
 brothers children to match together; yet (saith he) we haue by experience obserued, that issue proceedeth not of such marriage: and the holy Scripture teacheth vs, that we may not renewe the betwixt kinde of our kindred. Whence he concludeth, that euen those newly conuerued Christians (to whome he granted as great fauour as he might) should vvholy abstayne from marriage in the second degree: so that brethrens children marrying according to their new doctrine, contrary to the auncient Canons of the Church, doe liue in perpetual incest, and their children be no better then bastards; it is they then that allowe incest, and not we. In another case, the Protestants by their doctrine and practise doe confirme and ratifie adultery: for the innocent party (for example the Husband) taking his Wife in adulterie, doth not only put her away by diuorfe; but may also marry another, his former wife yet liuing; vvhich to be playne adultery no meane a learned man then *S. Augustine*, twelue hundred yeares past hath most soundly proued; and that out of the expresse word of God: and therefore did he intitle that his treatise, *De adulterio conjugij*; of adulterious marriages.

The fourth sort of Popish magicks, sorcery, and witchcraft, is the consecration of their Host, and making holy bread and holy water, and such likes, and by driving out of the Devil by the signe of the crosse, by exorcismes and ringing of bells, &c. For these things haue no force eyther by their creation, or by any variation out of Gods word: as those words of our possessor sheweth, *Mat. 23. 19.* If he be sorcery and witchcraft to consecrate the body of Christ (which is done by due pronounciation of Christs wordes) then was Christ the author of that sorcery, and he himselfe that first consecrated it, a sorcerer; which only to insinuate is most damnable. See what wicked enemies of Christ we haue vnder the habire of Ministers: and what a legger-headed lie is it, to say that we haue no warrant in Gods word for the blessing of bread, water, oyle, and such likes, when *S. Paul* saith, *1 Cor. 10. 16.* The all

Lib. 15. do

c. 16.

Cap. 6. in-

ter. Aug.

ad Greg.

1. Tim. 4. thing that sanctifies and made holy by the word of God and prayer. And if in the
 vers. 5. old testament, The sprinkling of the ashes of a calfe did sanctifie them on whom
 Heb. 9. it was cast: Why may not water with vs doe as much being hallowed by
 vers. 13. prayer, and making the signe of the crosse over it, by which we request
 God to blesse it through the vertue of Christs passion, expressed by the
 signe of the crosse? and hauing receiued such blessing, we vse it then more
 confidently to such purposes as they are blessed for; not doubting but
 that God will respect the prayers of his holy Church; and the good mea-
 ning of him that vseth them. And as for bells, they being dedicated to the
 seruice of God, for the assembling of his people together to worship him,
 and hauing many deuout prayers said ouer them to that purpose, we
 doubt not but that the very sound of them is terrible to the enemies of
 God, as being the trumpets of his army. And as the walles of Hiericho fel-
 lowe to the earth at the sound of the Israelites trumpets and voices: so the
 furious working of the common enemy shall be abated; when he heareth
 by the ringing of the bells, Gods people called togetherto joyne in pray-
 er against him.

Isaie 6.
 vers. 5.

The first sinne is perjury, which they maintain, because they teach that a Pa-
 pist examined, may answer doubtfully against the intention of the examiner
 framing another meaning to himselfe. As for example, when a man is asked
 whether he said or heard Masse in such a place, though he did, he may say that he
 did not, and sweare to it, meaning he was not there to reueale it to him; whereas
 in the law of nature he that taketh an oath, should sweare according vnto the inten-
 tion of him that hath power to minister an oath, and that in truth, justice, and
 judgement; so that they themselues shew their distance from all defence of perjury, if they
 can shew from thence they are not bound to sweare, without it.

Answer. If he had cited but one author, you should haue heard a full
 satisfaction of this matter. The truth is, that swearing a truth in his mea-
 ning that sweareth it, although it be against the intention of him that mi-
 nistred the oath, may be lawfully vsed in two cases. The first, if he that
 ministred the oath, haue not sufficient authority to minister it. The se-
 cond, when hauing authority he asketh something beyond the order of
 lawe, and against justice; then he that sweareth is excused by the rule
 touched by Mr. B. 3. himselfe, because a man must sweare as in truth,
 so in justice; that is, to doe or say nothing against justice. And so when
 one enquireth after saying or hearing Masse, as of a layman or crinie to
 punish good Christians for it, the man is bound not to reueale it, as being
 against true justice, to make us neyghbours punished for so holy a fact.

The second is, that they neuer deny any of Gods Commandments in this matter
 that sinne which Gods word maketh a sinne; for example, If one shall say

hills

Each thing that causeth notable hurt, that is no mortall sinne; and a merry or officious lie is but a veniall sinne, &c. If Catholike make stealing of thinges of smale value, and officious lies veniall sinnes; then M. PER. committeth herein a mortall sinne, in belying them so maliciously, as to affirme them to make that no sinne, which Gods word maketh a sinne: seeing that by his owne confession vve make them and such like, sinnes, though not so haynous because there is lesse malice in them. He goeth on lying, vwhen he affirmeth vs to say, that none is bound to saluate his enemy: for vve hold all men bound to saluate their enemies, and to afford them all common duties of ciuilliey, and though it be but a counsell to yeeld them the extraordinary offices of friendshippe, yet vve hold that it is much more Christian-like so to doe. As for rash judgement so dauidely giuen without aduisement, I see not howe it can be more then a veniall sinne: for the party considering better of the matter, chaudgeth his opinion straightway, and so doth his neighbour no yrrong. And if it be the part of a wise man sometimes to dissemble, according vnto that saying of the wise: *Sapientia est loco dissimulare*; then surely is it better to dissemble and sayne holynesse, then wickednesse. As for painting of the face in a moderate and modest fashion, to amend the fauour, vwhen it is done without any euill end or purpose, and without scandall, I see not howe one can make any more of it, then a veniall sinne: but to daube the countenance so as some leude women doe, to allure men thereby to vnlawfull lust, is without doubt very damnable, and for no other is taken of Catholikes. Touching begging, let him name who holdeth it for vnlawfull to prohibite and forbidde it, if sufficient meanes be otherwise provided for the maintaynance of the poore, for I knowe none such. True it is, because the truth it selfe hath so said: *That we shall haue alwayes the poore among vs.* But who doubteth but that it is much better, to prouide for them charitably in some certayne places of aboade, then to suffer them to wander vp and downe idly, and to liue dissolutely, as the greater part of them are thought to doe. Moreover, no authour can be truly said to vphold or excuse *blasphemy* or *swearing*, though vwhen they deliuer their opinions in schooles concerning that matter, they affirme that rash choler to thes (not being vsuall) are no mortall sinnes, because they breake out in manner against a mans vvill, choler for the time troubling and hindering the vse of reason.

M. PERKINS doth lastly charge our writers with manifest lying, to iustifie our doctrine, in that they plead all antiquity to be on our sides: whereas (saith he) it is as much for them as for vs.

Hereof he yeeldeth no prooffe, and no maruaile; for many of his brethren are ashamed to denie this, and doe ingeniously confesse, that in

Mat. 26.
vers. 11.

many points of religion the ancient Fathers are wholly for vs. And in no one point that I can heare off, will he or any of his pew-fellowes be trayed by the iudgement and consent of antiquity : vvhich is a most manifest prooffe, that in their owne conscience they knowe wel enough, that a antiquity is flat against them ; else vvhich should they so feare to stand vnder their most vpright determination, and so fleete and flie from it : vvhich point vvell considered off, is alone sufficient to dissuade any man from their newe doctrine. For it not agreeing with the doctrine of pure antiquity, must needs be false and wicked ; because that was most true, holily, and good : And the holy Ghost doth nor now teach one to be true, and afterward change. After his Lastly he hath : *Againe, that our manner is to proue our opinions by forged and counterfeit writings of men ; namely by S. Iames litargie, by the Canons of the Apostles, by the bookes of Dionysius Areopagita, and so forth reckoning vp some one and twenty peece, which he calleth counterfeit, but he goeth not about to proue any one of them to be forged.* It may therefore suffice for answer, that when he or any other shall vnder take to proue, that we vse any forged writings to confirme our doctrine, they shall (God willing) be answered. In the meane season the better to content such weaklings, I have not past once (to my remembrance) alleged any sentence out of these bookes, by him suspected for counterfeit. And as touching the marrying of a *Catholike* with a *Protestant*, we dislike it more then many Ministers, who will make no bones to marrie them together, which no *Catholike* Priest will doe. Finally, we accord with him in leagues of amity as heearneth them, and hold that *Catholike* and *Protestant* Princes, may not combine in league to defend each other in all causes, or else one should stand bound to aide the other sometimes against both honesty and religion ; which were very absurd : So as where Mr. Paine saith well (vvhich he doth seldome in this booke of his) I willingly agree with him, not sparing on the other side to reprehend that which he speaketh against the truth, vvhich all indifferant men will (I hope) take to be honest vpright dealing. Here endeth his booke, where it not that after this put to it, he addeth a further Acknowledgement, which may not be left unanswered : vvhich therefore, I have annexed hereunto both it and the answer, before I come to the full period of this

works.

Careless Reader,

**BEARE WITH THE FAULTS IN PRINTING,
WHICH CAN HARDLY BE FEW CONSIDER-**

ING THE MANIFOLD DIFFICULTIES OF THE
time: And yet (besides the over-sights in
pointing) are not very ma-
ny, which be thus
corrected.

IN THE MARGENT THESE.

Generally a ff. is set in the quotation of *Caluins Institution*
for the Section or Number.

For.	Page.	Read.
<i>Bez4</i> in Neoph.	9.	in <i>Creophag.</i>
<i>simil.</i>	<i>ibid.</i>	<i>Simler.</i>
seß. 17. 2.	11.	number 1. & 2.
Homil. in præfat.	48.	In <i>proverbia</i> ad Corinth.
Conc.	56.	Canon.

IN THE TEXT THESE.

For.	Page.	Line.	Read.
declared	7	15	declare
<i>Arbeifme</i>	20	9	<i>Arbeifmes</i>
was this	40	35	was it
pithagorically	63.	22	pithagorically, I say
to solemnely	86	22	to be solemnely
<i>Euchirinet</i>	135	24	<i>Euchirius</i>
established	145	17	establish
<i>Cefanis</i>	155	39	<i>Cefarius</i>
<i>Pomacibus</i>	156	1	<i>Pamacibus</i>
deuised	180	18	deuised
proofe	181	16	disproofe

The quotation of *S. Augustine* which is in *psalm. 33. conc. 2.* is omitted
in the 68. page.

Hier. cont. Lucif. cap. 6. wanteth page 209.

And in the Advertisement, pageth 25. for *apud Dionysium 1. Cor. reade*
apud Ludolphum de vita Christi, part. 1. cap. 5. pag. 17.

A N
ANSVVERE VNTO
M. PERKINS ADVERTISEMENT.

M. PERKINS *Aduertisement to all fauouers of the Roman religion, shewing (as he weeneth) that the said Religion is against the Catholike principles of the Catechisme, that hath beene agreed vpon euer since the dayes of the Apostles, by al Churches: which principles be forre. The Apostles Creede: the tenne Commandements: the Lordes prayer: the institution of two Sacraments, Baptisme and the Lordes supper.*

I. COR. II. vers. 23.

IHAD once determined to haue wholly omitted this goodly post-script, because it containeth (in manner) nothing else, but an irksome repetition of that, which hath beene (I will not say twise before, but more then twenty times) handled ouer and ouer, in this former small treatise: notwithstanding, considering both howe ready many are, when they see any thing omitted, to say that it could not be answered; and also for that these pointes here reiterated, are the most odious that he could cull out of all the rest to vrge against vs: I finally resolved to giue them a short answer; And further, also by prouing their newe religion, to be very opposite vnto those old groundes of the true religion, to requite him with the like, that I did not in his debt. Thus he beginneth.

The Roman religion established by the Councell of Trent, is in the principall pointes thereof, against the very groundes of the Catechisme: the Creede: the tenne Commandements: the Lordes prayer: the two Sacraments.

THE Catholike religion embraced and defended by the Church of Rome, was planted and established thereby the Apostles S. Peter and S. Paul, fifteene hundred yeares before the Councell of Trent, and hath beene euer since, by the Bishops of Rome their lawfull successors, constantly retained, and most sincerely obserued and maintayned: some articles thereof, called into question by the Heretikes of this latter age, were in that most learned generall Councell of Trent, declared and defined. And great meruaile it were, if the principall pointes thereof, should be against the groundes of the Catechisme, which is in euery point most substantially expounded, by the decree and order of the very same Councell. Or is it credible, that the Church of Rome (with which all other

ancient Churches and holy Fathers, did desire to agree; and which hath beene ever most diligent to observe all Apostolicall traditions) should in the principall points of faith, crosse and destroy the very principles of that religion; that hath beene agreed vpon by all Churches ever since the Apostles daies, as he saith? Is it not much more likely and probable, that the Protestantes, who slander all Churches, ever since the time of the Apostles, with some kind of corruption or other, and who hold no kind of Apostolicall tradition to be necessary: is it not (I say) more credible, that they should shake those groundes of faith, which come by tradition from the Apostles, and have beene ever since by all Churches agreed vpon? I suppose that fewe men of any indifferent judgement, can thinke the contrarie. But let vs descend to the particulars, wherein the truth will appeare more plainly. Thus beginneth Master PERKINS with the Creede.

First of all it must be considered, that some of the principall doctrines beleued in the Church of Rome, are; that the Bishoppe of Rome is the Vicar of Christ, and head of the Catholike Church: that there is a fire of Purgatory: that Images of God and Saintes, are to be placed in the Church, and worshipped: that prayer is to be made to Saintes departed: that there is a propitiatory sacrifice daylie offered in the Masse, for the sinnes of the quick and the dead. These pointes are of that moment, that without them the Roman religion cannot stand, &c. And yet marks the Apostles Creede, which hath beene thought to contayne all necessary pointes of religion to be beleued, and hath therefore beene called the key and rule of faith: This Creede (I say) hath not any of these pointes, nor the expositions made thereof by the ancient Fathers; nor any other Creede or confession of faith made by any Councell or Church, for the space of many hundred yeares. This is a plaine prooffe to any indifferent man, that these be newe articles of faith, neuer knowne in the Apostolike Church; and that the Fathers and Councils could not finde any such articles of faith in the bookes of the old and newe Testament. Answer is made, that all these points of doctrine are beleued vnder the article, (I beleue the Catholike Church:) the meaning whereof they will haue to be this. I beleue all thinges which the Catholike Church holdeth and teacheth to be beleued. If this be as they say, we must beleue in the Church: that is, put our confidence in the Church, for the manifestation and the certainty of all doctrine necessary to saluation. And thus the eternall truth of God the creatour, shall depend vpon the determination of the creature; And the written word of God in this respect is made insufficient, as though it had not plainly reuealed all points of doctrine pertaining to saluation. And the ancient Churches haue beene farre ouer-seene, that did not prou-
pound

found the former pointes to be beleued as articles of faith, but left them to these later times. Thus farre Master PERKINS : Wherein are huddled vp many thinges confusedly : I will answer briefly and distinctlie to euery point.

The first is, that in the Apostles Creede are contained all pointes of religion necessary to be beleued, which is most apparantly false, as the Protestantes themselues must needes confesse; or else graunt, that it is not necessary to beleue the King to be Supream-head of the Church : or that the Church is to be gouerned by Bishops : or that yve are justified by Christes justice imputed to vs : or that there be but two Sacramentes : or that the Church seruice must be said in the vulgar tongue : or that all thinges necessary to be beleued to saluation, are contained in the Scriptures. To be short, not one article of their religion (which is contrary to ours) is contained in this Creede of the Apostles : therefore to affirme as he doth, all necessarie pointes of religion to be contained in this Creede, is to cast their owne religion flat to the ground, and to teach, that not one point of it is to be beleued : this Creede may neuerthelesse be called the *key and rule of faith*, because it containeth the principall pointes of the Christian religion, and doth open (as it were) the doore vnto all the rest, and guide a man certainly ynto the knowledge of them, by teaching ys to beleue the *Catholike Church*, *1. Tim. 3.* which being the *pillar and ground of truth*, directed and guided by the spirit *vers. 15.* of truth, will alwaies instruct her obedient children, in all truth necessary to saluation. *Iob. 16.* *vers. 13.*

Then saith Master PERKINS : *The eternal truth of God, the creature shal depend on the determination of the creature.*

Nothing lesse : for Gods truth is most sincere and certaine in it selfe, before anie declaration of the Church : but yve poore creatures that are subject to mistaking and error, should not so certaynelie vnderstand and knowe that truth of God, vnlesse he had ordained and appointed such a skilfull and faithfull Mistris and interpreter, to assure vs both what is his word, and what is the true meaning of it. Like as pure gold, is not made perfect in it selfe by the Gold-smithes touch-stone; but other men are thereby assured, that it is true and pure gold : euen so the word of God doth not borrowe his truth from the Church; but the true children of God are by the holie Church assured, which is the same his word. If we did hold (as we doe not) that the written vvord containeth all pointes of doctrine necessarie to saluation : yet vvere it most necessarie to relie vpon the *Catholike Churches* declaration, both to be assured which bookes of Scriptures be Canonically,

which not; (whereupon S. Augustine (a man of farre better judgement
Con. Epist. then any of these daies) said, that he would not beleue the Gospell, vnlesse the
Ind. cap. 5. authority of the Church moued him thereunto:) as also to vnderstand them truly;
 because the wordes of holy Scripture, without the true meaning and
 sence of them, doe but deceiue men and leade them into errour; and to
 that end haue alwaies beene, and yet are, by Heretikes abused, to drawe
 others after them into destruction.

The like may be said of other ancient Creedes, and confessions of faith,
 which holding the Apostles Creede, did adde some fewe pointes vnto it:
 namely, such as were in those daies called into question by Heretikes of
 greater fame, and who were followed of many, not touching in particular
 diuers other articles generally beleueed of all true Christians, or else by
 some fewe and obscure men only questioned. Wherefore to argue that no
 other pointes of faith are to be beleueed, but such as are expressed in an-
 cient Creedes, is to cut of a great part of our faith.

Lastly, it is most vntue to say that those ancient Fathers and Councils
 knewe not of these articles of faith by him mentioned: for they haue most
 plainly taught them in their writings: yea, and expressly condemned of
 heresie, most of the contrary positions, nowe againe reuiued and holden
 by the Protestantes; as in those seuerall questions I haue before proued.

Touching beleueing in the Church, which he thrusteth in by the way, we
 vse not that phrase, as the very Creede sheweth; following therein S. Au-
 gustine with others, who hold, that to beleue in a thing, is to make it our
 creatour, by giuing our whole hart vnto it; in which sence we beleue not
 in Saintes, nor in the Church: albeit some other ancient Doctors, take the
 wordes to beleuenem, not so precisely, but say that me may beleue in the
 Church & in Saintes: that is, beleue certainly that the Catholike Church
 is the only true company of Christians; and that to the lawfull gover-
 nours thereof, it appertaineth to declare both which bookes be Canoni-
 call, and what is the true meaning of all doubtfull places in them: so we
 beleue the Saintes in heauen to heare our prayers; to be carefull to pray
 for vs, & to be able to obtaine by intreaty much at Gods handes, in whose
 high fauour they liue. Thus much in answer vnto that which M. PER-
 objecteth in generall, nowe to that he saith in particuler.

He chargeth vs first, with the breach of the third article, Conceiued by the
 holy Ghost: which (saith he) is ouerturned by the transubstantiation of bread
 and wine in the Masse, into the body and blond of Christ: for here we are taught
 to confesse the true and perpetuall incarnation of Christ, beginning in his concep-
 tion, and neuer ending after ward.

Ans. Here is a strange exposition of the Creede. Is Christs incar-
 nation

nation perpetuall, and not yet ended? then it is true to say, that Christ is not yet incarnate; as we may say truly, that a man is not borne, vntill his birth be accomplished and ended. But to the present purpose: because Christes incarnation beganne at his conception, cannot bread be turned afterward into his body? how hangeth this together? Belike he meanes that *Christes body was but once conceived, and that was by the holy Ghost in his mothers wombe*: therefore it cannot afterward be made of any other thing. This to be his meaning, he declares in the question of the Sacrament; but it is too too simple and childish. For we hold him not to be so conceived by bread, as he was by the holy Ghost, who was the efficient cause of his conception: but that the same body that was cōceiued by the holy Ghost, is made really present in the Sacrament, by transubstantiation of bread into it, which hath no opposition at al with this article, as I haue more largely proued in the foresaid question. And whereas he saith further, cleane besides the purpose of this article, *that Christes body hath the essentiall properties of a true body, standing of flesh and bone*: we grant the same; but when he addeth *that local circumscription cannot be seuered from a body*, he is deceiued: for the greatest body of all others, (which is the highest heauen) is not circumscribed by any place; because there is no other body without it, whose extremities might compasse in, and circumscribe that body of the highest heauen. And when he saith, *that to be circumscribed in place, is an essentiall property of euery quantity; and that quantity is the common essence of euery body*: he makes himselfe but a common mocking-stocke vnto euery simple Logitian, who knoweth that no accident (such as euery quantity is) can be of the essence and nature of a substance, such as Christes body is. Neither would any man say, (that cared what he said) that to be circumscribed in a place is essentiall to euery quantity, when all numbers that be quantities, haue no relation vnto any place: neither is it of the essence of any quantity to be actually circumscribed by a place; but it is a property flowing out of the essence of one only kinde of quantity, *to be apt, and fit to be circumscribed* and compassed about with a place. And naturally all bodies (except the highest heauen) haue one place, out of which they passe (as S. Augustine said) when they come into another: but by the omnipotent power of God, any body may be separated from his place, or be in as many places at once, as it shal please God to seate it; because to be circumscribed with a place actually, is a meere accident vnto a substantiall body, and without the nature of quantity; and God may not without blasphemy be disabled to seperate a substance from an accident. By this is confused also his second instance: *Christ is ascended into heauen, and sitteth at the right hand of God the Father, therefore his body is not really and locally in the Sa-*

Chris. lib.
3. de Sa-
cerd.

crament. This followeth not, because it is in both places at once, as S. Chrisostome in expresse termes teacheth. O miracle! O goodnesse of God! he that sitteth aboue with his Father, at the very same instant is touched with the bandes of all men, and giueth himselfe to them that will receiue and embrace him! See more of this in the question of the blessed Sacrament, where M. PERKIN citeth the very same authorities, which he here repeateth: see my answer to them there.

Thirdly, he reasoneth thus: In that we beleue the Catholike Church, it followeth that it is inuisible, because things seene, are not beleueed.

We answer: that the persons in the Catholike Church are, and euer were visible, euen to Iewes and Heathens who persecuted them; but the inward indowmentes of those persons: that is, their faith, hope, and charitie; their assistance by Gods spirit, and such like Christian qualities, are inuisible and to be beleueed. And euen as a man is truly said to be visible, though he consist aswell of an inuisible soule, as of a visible body: so the Church is visible, for the visible persons, visible teaching and administering of Sacraments in it; albeit the inward qualities of it be not visible.

His last objection against vs out of the Creede, is: That the articles of remission of sinnes; resurrection of the body; and life euerlasting, containe a confession of speciall faith. For the meaning of them is thus much: I beleue the remission of mine owne sinnes, and the resurrection of mine owne body to life euerlasting.

Answer. That is not the meaning, vnlesse you adde some conditions: to wit, I beleue the remission of my sinnes, if I haue duly vsed the meanes ordained by our Sauour for the remission of them; which is after Baptisme, the Sacrament of Penance. Item, I beleue I shal haue life euerlasting, if I keepe (as Christ willed the yong-man to keepe) Gods commandments, or (at the least) if I doe die with true repentance. Nowe whether I haue done or shall doe these things required of me, I am not so well assured, as that I can beleue it: for I may be deceiued therein; but I haue or may haue a very good hope, by the grace of God to performe them. Neither is there any more to be gathered out of S. Augustine, as some of the wordes by himselfe here alleaged doe conuince. For he requireth besides faith, that we turne from our sinnes, conforme our will to Gods will, and abide in the lappe of the Catholike Church; and so at length we shall be healed. See the question of certainty of saluation. Note also by the way, the vncertainty of M. PER. doctrine, concerning this point: for he holdeth that it is not necessary to haue a certaine perswasion of our owne saluation, but that it is sufficient to haue a desire to haue it: and that doctrine he putteth there (as he

pag. 270.
or 275.

faith

saith himselfe) to expound the Catechismes, that propound faith at so high a reach, as fewe can attaine vnto: yet here and else where, the good man forgetting himselfe, chargeth vs to crosse the Creede, because we doe not wrest faith vp to so high a straine; and so in heate of quarelling, often expoundeth this contrary to his owne rule. Nowe for prooffe of S. Augustines opinion herein (whome he only citeth) takethese two sentences for the two points he speaketh of. For the first, that we be certaine by ordinary faith of our saluation, let this serue. *Of life euerlasting, which God De bono (that cannot lie) hath promised to his children, no man can be secure (and out perseuer. of danger) before his life be ended, which is a tentation vpon earth.* Secondly, cap. 22. that a man once truly justified may after ward fall: We must beleue (saith this De correct. holie Father) that certaine of the children of perdition doe line in faith, that war- & grat. keth by charity, and so doe for a time line faithfully and justly (they were then cap. 13. truly justified) and yet after ward doe fall, and that finally; because he calleth then the children of perdition. Thus much in answer vnto that, which Master PERKINS objecteth against our religion out of the Creede, which (as you haue seene) consulteth wholly vpon his owne forced exposition, and vaine illations.

Hence he proceedeth to the tenne Commandements. But before I followe him thither, I may not omitte here to declare howe the Protestant Doctores doe fouly mangle, and in manner ouer-turne the greatest part of the Creede. Obserue first, that according to their common doctrine, it is not necessary to beleue this Creede at all, because it is no part of the written word: secondly, that Calvin doubteth whether it were made by Cal. lib. 2. the Apostles or no; being then no part of the written word, not made by Instit. cap. the Apostles, it must by their doctrine be wholly rejected. Nowe to the 16. sess. 18 particular.

1. Concerning the first article, I beleue in God the Father almighty, maker of heauen and earth, they doe erre many waies. First, they doe destroy the most simple vnitie of the God-head, by teaching the diuine essence to be Confess. really distinguished into three persons. If the diuine nature be really distin- dei gener. guished into three, there must needes be three diuine essences or natures: ergo, three Gods. Calvin also saith, that the Sonne of God hath a distinct sub- In this stance from his Father. Melancthon, that there be aswell three diuine natures, Serueti. as three persons, in locis de Christo.

pag. 872.

Secondly, they ouerthrowe the Father in the God-head, by denying the Sonne of God, to haue receiued the diuine nature from his Father: as Calvin, Beza, and Whitakers doe. See the Preface.

Thirdly, howe is God almightie, if he cannot doe all things that haue no manifest repugnance in them? But he cannot after the opinion of
of

of diuers of them, make a body to be without locall circumscription, or to be in two places at once; which notwithstanding some others of them In collog. hold to be possible, as *Zwinglius*, *Oecolampadius*, *Andreas Volanus*, &c. *Marpurg.* Fourthly, though we beleue God to be maker of heauen and earth; art. 29. yet neuer none but blasphemous *Heretikes*, held him to be true authour *Ls. 1. cont.* and proper worker of al euil done vpon earth by men. Such neuerthelesse *Scargum*, be *Bucer*, *Zwinglius*, *Caluin*, and others of greatest estimation among the *cap. 14.* Protestantes. See the Preface.

2. And in *Iesvs Christ* his only Sonne our Lord. They must needs hold Christ not to be Gods true naturall Sonne, which denie him to haue receiued the diuine nature from the Father: againe, they make him according to his God-head, inferiour to his Father. See the Preface.

3. Borne of the Virgin *MARY*. Many of them teach, that Christ was borne Dialog. de as other children are, with breach of his Mothers virginity, as *Bucer*, and corpore *Molmens* in *vnione Euangelij* part. 3. and *Caluin* signifieth no lesse in *homo*. Christi. *sup. 2. Matb. vers. 13.*

4. Suffered vnder *Pontius Pilate*, crucified, dead, and buried. *Friar Luther* pag. 94. (with a great band of his followers) doth roughly defend, that the *Gal.* head it selfe suffered; which to be blasphemy, *Musculus* doth proue in his De consil. booke of the errorrs of *Luthers* Schollers: yet *Beza* with all them that hold part. 2. Christ to haue beene our mediatur, according to his diuine nature, can 276. hardly saue themselves from the same blasphemy. For the chiefest act of Christes mediation, consisteth in his death: if then the God-head did not suffer that death, it had no part in the principal point of Christes mediatio. Hither also appertaine all these their blasphemies, to wit: that Christ was so frighted with the apprehension of death, that he forgotte himselfe to be our mediator; yea refused (as much as in him lay) to be our redeemer: Item, that he thought himselfe forsaken of God, and finally despaired. See the Preface.

5. Descended into hell, the third day he arose againe from the dead. It is worth a mans labour, to behold their goodly variety of expositions about Christes descending into hell: *Beza* followed of *Corliel* our Country-man, thinks 2. Apolog. this to haue crept into the Creede by negligence; and so the French Hugonots, and ad Sanct. Flemish Gues haue cast it cleane out of their Creede: but they are misliked of many others, who had rather admit the wordes, because they be found in *Athanasius* Creede, and also in the old Roman Creede expounded by *Ruffinus*: but they doe most peruersly expound them. *Caluin* saith, that Christes suffering of the paines of hell on the Crosse, is signified by these wordes: but he pleaseth not some others of them; becaue Christes suffering and death also, goeth before his descending into hel, and the wordes must be taken orderly as they lie. Thirdly, diuers of them will haue it to signifie

signifie, the laying of Christes body in the graue; but that is signified plainly by the word, *buried*. Wherefore some others of them expound it to signifie, the lying of his body in the graue three daies, which M. P. ER. approveth as the best; but it is as wide from the proper and literall signification of the wordes, as can be. For what likenesse is there betweene lying in the graue, and descending into hell? Besides, *Caluin* their great Rabin misliketh this exposition, as much as any of the rest, and calleth it an *Lib. 2. Idle fancy*. Fourthly, *Luther*, *Smideline*, and others cited by *Beza*, *art. 2. stir. ca 16. sess. 8.* doe say, that Christes soule after his death went to hell, where the Diuels are, there to be punished for our sinnes, thereby to purchase vs a fuller redemption; which is so blasphemous that it needes not any refutation. As ridiculous is another, receiued of most *Protestantes*; that Christes soule went into Paradise, which well vnderstood is true. For his soule in hell, had the joyes of Paradise; but to make that an exposition of Christes descending into hell, is to expound a thing by the flat contrary of it. Al these and some other expositions also, the *Protestantes* haue deuised, to lead their followers from the ancient, and only true interpretation of it: to wit, that Christ in soule descended vnto those lower partes of the earth, where all the soules departed from the beginning of the world, were detained by the iust iudgement of God, till Christ had paid their ransome; and were not admitted into the kingdome of heauen, before Christ had opened them the way thither.

6. Concerning *Christes resurrection*, they doe also erre. For whereas a resurrection is the rising vp of the very same body that died, with all his naturall partes: they denie Christ to haue taken againe the *same blood*, *Cal. in 27. Math.* which he shed in his passion; and yet is the blood one notable part of the body. *Caluin* also affirmeth it to be an *old wifes dream*, to thinke that in *Perkins* Christes handes and feete there remaine the print of nailes, and the wound *pag. 194.* in his side, notwithstanding that Christ shewed them to his Disciples, and *In cap. 14. offered them to be touched of S. Thomas. Luca.*

7. About *Christes assension into heauen*, they doe somewhat dissent from the truth. For some of them say, that Christs body did not pearce through the heauens by vertue of a glorious body (least they should thereby be compelled to graunt, that two naturall bodies may be together in one place, and therefore as well one true body in two places at once) but that broad gappes were made in the lower heauens, to make him way to the highest, which is very ridiculous, and more against true Philosophy: they say also, that he was not the first man that entered into the possession of *1. Cor. 15. heauen*, which is flat against the Scriptures, that call Christ the *first fruites vers. 21. and first begotten* of the dead. Thirdly, they locke Christ so closely vp in *Col. 1. 18, heauen,*

Beza in c. heaven, that they hold it impossible for him to remoue thence at any time
2. affirm before the last iudgement (for feare they should otherwise be inforced to
 confesse, that his body may be in two places at once) which is to make him
 not Lord of the place, but some poore prisoner therein. And as for Christs
sitting on the right hād of his Father, they are not yet agreed what it signifieth.

L. 1. ar. 25 See Conrad. *Caluin plainly saith, that after the later iudgemēt be shal sit there
de concor. no longer. That God shal then render to euery man according to his workes (as holy
 Caluinist. Scripture very often doth testifie) al the packe of them doth vterly denie.

**L. 2. Insti 8.* I beleue in the holy Ghost. First Caluin and his followers (who hold the
c. 14. ss. 3. holy Ghost to haue the God-head of himselfe, and not to haue receiued it from the
 Father and the Sonne) must consequently denie the holy Ghost to proceede

In the from the Father and the Sonne, as hath beene else where proued. Secondly,
Preface. they make him much inferiour vnto the other persons: for they teach in
 their French Catechismes, that the Father alone is to be adored in the name of the

In cap. 6. Sonne. And Caluin against Gentil saith, that the title of creatour belongeth only to
 & *19. Isa.* the Father: and else where, that the Father is the first degree & cause of life, and
 & *in 16.* the Sonne the second. And that the * Father holdeth the first ranke of honour and

Marc. gouernement, and the Sonne the second; where the holy Ghost is either quite
 * *In 26.* excluded from part with the Father and the Sonne, or at most, must be
Math. v. content with the third degree of honour.

64. 9. I beleue the holy Catholike Church, the communion of Saints. First, where
one as there is but one Catholike Church, as the Councell of Nice expressly defi-

neth, following sundry textes of the word of God; they commonly teach
 that there be two Churches: one inuisible of the elect; another visible
boly of both good and bad. Secondly, they imagine it to be holy, by the imputati-

on of Christes holinesse to the elected Bretheren, and not by the infusion
 of the holy Ghost into the hartes of all the faithfull. Thirdly, they cannot
Catholike abide the name Catholike in the true sence of it: that is, they wil not beleue

the true Church, to haue beene alwaies visibly extant since the Apostles
 time, and to haue bin generally spread into all Countries; otherwise they

must needs forsake their owne Church, which began with Friar Luther,
 and is not receiued generally in the greatest part of the Christian world.

Finally, they beleue no Church, no nor their owne in all points of faith:
 but hold that the true Church may erre in some principall points of faith.

Howe then can any man safely relie his saluation, vpon the credite of such
 an vncertaine ground & erring guide? may they not then as well say that
 they doe not beleue the *one Catholike* Church: because they doe as well
 not beleue it, as beleue it? And as for the communion of Saints, their learned

masters doe commonly cassier it out of the Creede, and that not without
 cause. For by the *Saints* vnderstanding (as the Apostles did) al good Chri-

tians,

stians whither alieue or departed this world, they that deny praier to *Saints*, and for the *soules in Purgatory*, haue reason to reject the common society & entercourse that is betweene the *Saints*, and the mutuall honour and help, which such good Christian soules doe yeeld and afford one to another.

10. *The forgiveness of finnes*. It is not easily to find what is their settled opinion, touching the forgiveness of originall sinne in Infants. Some attribute it to Baptisme; but that cannot stand with their common doctrine, that *Sacraments haue no vertue in them to remit finnes, or to giue grace*. Others say, that God without any meanes doth then, when they be baptised, of himselfe immediately iustifie them; but that cannot stand in their owne doctrine, because Infants want the instrument of faith to lay hold on that iustice then offered by God, and therefore cannot being so yonge, take it vnto them. Others will haue Infants sanctified in their mothers wombe, by vertue of a covenant, which they suppose God to haue made with old father *Abraham*, and all his faithfull seruants, that (forsooth) their seede shall be holy; But this is most phantastical, and contrary to the Scriptures and daily experiences; for *Isaac* was the sonne of promise, and yet *Esau* his sonne was a reprobate; *Dauides* father was a Godly *Israelite*, and yet *Dauid* affirmeth, *Psal. 50.* that he himselfe was conceived in iniquities; and we may see whole Countries nowe turned *Turkes*, whose ancestors were good Christians: therefore not all the soules of the faithfull, are sanctified in their mothers wombes. Secondly, how euil Gender they agree about the remission of sinne; yet there is a perfect consent among them, that such reliques of originall sinne remaine in euery man baptised and sanctified, that it infecteth all and euery worke he doth, with deadly sinne: yea that which remaineth is properly sinne in it selfe, though it be not imputed to the party; so that sinne is alwaies in them, though their finnes be neuer so well forgiven. And as for the *Sacrament of Penance*, by which we hold all finnes committed after Baptisme to be forgiven; they do renounce the benefit of it, and are at vtter defiance with it.

11. *The resurrection of the bodies*. Whether *Farel* the first Apostle of the *Geneuian Gospel* doubted thereof or no, let his successor *Caluin* tell you, who answereth *Farels* letter thus. That the resurrection of this our flesh doth seeme *Episto. ad* to thee incredible, no meruaile, &c. Again, many of them teach that *Christ Farelsum.* tooke not his blood againe, which he shed vpon the crosse; yea, some of them are so gracelesse, as to say; that his precious blood where with we were redeemed, *Vide Con-* rooted away on the earth. 1600. yeares agoe. If then it be not necessary to *radum, li.* a true resurrection, to rise againe with the same blood; why is it necessary *1. art. 20.* to rise againe with the same bones and flesh, the one being as perfect a part of a mans body as the other?

12. *Life everlasting.* First, Captaine Caluin holdeth it for very certaine, that no soule doth enter into the joyes of heauen (wherein consisteth life everlasting) vntill the day of doome. These be his wordes: the soules of
 3. *Institu.* 25. *Jeff.* 6. the Godly hauing ended the labour of this war-fare, doe goe into a blessed rest, where they expect the enjoying of the promised glory: And that all thinges are holden in suspence vntill Christ the redeemer appeare; whose opinion is yet better then was his predecessor *Luthers*. For he teacheth in many places, that the
ENARRA. in soules of the Godly departing from their bodies, haue no sence at all, but doe lie fast
Gen. c. 26. a sleepe vntill the latter day: Take this one for a tast. Another place to proue, In *Ecclesi.* that the dead feele, or vnderstand nothing: wherefore *Salomon* thought the dead
 c. 9. v. 10. to be wholly a sleepe, and to perceiue nothing at all. And againe, the sleepe of the soule in the life to come, is more profound then in this life. And *Luther* with this
 Li. 9. *bist.* one position of his (as that famous historiographer *Iohn Sleidan* recordeth) ouerthrew two points of Popery: to wit, praying to Saintes; for they are so fast a sleepe, that they cannot heare vs: and praying for the dead; For they in Purgatory slept also so soundly, that they felt no paines. A meete foundation surely to build such false doctrine vpon. But *Brentius* is most plaine
 In 20. *Luc* in this matter, who ingeniously confesseth; that, albeit there were not many
bom. 35. among them, that did professe publicly the soules to die with the body; yet the most vncleane life, which the greatest part of their followers did lead, doth clearly shewe, that in their hartes they thinke no life to be after this: yea, that many such speeches doe sometimes proceede from them. Finally, it is a grosse error of theirs, to thinke that every meane Godly man, shall be then made equall
 In 1. *cap.* in glory with the Apostles, which *Luther* teacheth; whereas cleane contrary *S. Paul* declareth, that as one starre differeth from another in glory: so al-
Petri 1. 1. *Cor.* 15. so shall be the resurrection of the dead.
vers. 42.

I omit here many other particularities, that I be not ouer tedious: For these their bickerings against the very principles of our Christian faith, (not leauing any one article of our Creede vn-kirmished with all) will serue any indifferent man for a warning, to beware of their prophane doctrine, that leaue the high way to Infidelity. They vse to crie out much against the Antichrist of Rome, for corrupting the purity of the Gospell, as the wicked Elders did against the adultery of *Susanna*: but the iudicious Christian may easily espie, them themselues to be the true fore-runners of Antichrist in deed, by their so generall hacking and hewing at every point of the ancient Christian faith. Thus much concerning the Creede: now let vs passe to the Commandements.

First (saith Master PERKINS) it is a rule in expounding the seuerall Commandements, that all vertues of the same kind are reduced to that Commandement: Hence it followeth, that counsels of perfection are enjoined in the lawe, and therefore

fore prescribe no state of perfection beyond the scope of the lawe.

Ans. None of the counsels of perfection are enjoined in the tenne Commandements, though for some affinity, they may be reduced to some of them. For example: It is commanded that *I shall not steale*, that is: to take any of my neighbours goodes against his will; but to giue away all my owne to the poore, is beyond the compasse of the lawe: so likewise it is commanded not to commit adultery; but we are not commanded to vowe perpetuall chastity and obedience. Such offices only that are necessarily required to the performance of any commandement, are comprehended with in the same, but no others; though some men take occasion of the commandement, to treat of the counsels of perfection.

Secondly (saith M. P. E. R.) the Commandement, *thou shalt not make to thy selfe any grauen Image*, &c. hath two severall partes: the first forbiddeth the making of Images: the second the adoration of them. He concludeth out of Deutonomy, that the Images of the true Iehoua are forbidden in the Commandement, and consequently the adoration of such Images. Hence he will haue it to followe, that to worship God in or at Images with religious worship, is abominable Idolatrie.

Ans. First if the Images of God only be there prohibited, and then worship done to them according to his owne exposition, then it followeth most clearly, that there is no prohibition for either making or worshipping the Images of any Saints; and therefore with a very euill conscience doth he wrest the commandement against them. Secondly I say, though God had forbidden vs to worshipping Images, yet doth it not followe thereof, that we must not worship God in, or at Images. For as God is euery where; so may he be worshipped in all places, and as well at or before an Image; as in the Church, and before the communion table. Thirdly, we make no Images to expresse the nature of God, which is a spirit, and cannot be represented by lines and colours, but only a lowe of some such pictures, as set out some apparitions of God, recorded in the Bible; not doubting but that such workes of God, may aswell be exprest in colours to our eyes, as they are by wordes to our cares and vnderstanding. Lastly, touching religious worship to be done to Saintes or pictures, the Heretikes cauilling consisteth principally in the diuers taking of the word *religious*. For it is ambiguous, & principally signifieth the worship only due to God; *Analogon*. in which sence to giue it to any creature were Idolatry: but it is also with the best authors taken some other time, to signifie a worship due to creatures, for some supernaturall vertue or quality in them; and in this sence to tearme it detestable Idolatry, is either detestable malice, or damnable ignorance. And whereas (he saith) that common reason teacheth, that

they who adore God in Images, doe bind God and his hearing of vs, to certain things and places: I say the contrary, that God may be worshipped in all places; but we rather choose to worship him in Churches and before Images then in other places, because the sight of such holy things, doe breed more reuerence and deuotion in vs, & better keepe our mindes from wandering vpon vaine matters. If we taught that God could be worshipped no where else, or by no other meanes, then he had not lied so loudly. But let vs heare the end of his discourse: thus he argueth. *They that worship, they knowe not what, worship an Idol.* This expolition is false, vlesse they worship it with diuine honour. But goe on: *the Papists worship they knowe not what.* I prone it thus: to the consecration of the Host, there is required the intencion of the Priest: but they cannot haue any certainty of the Priestes intencion, wherefore they are not certaine whether it be bread, or the body of Christ. ergo, worshipping of it, they worship they knowe not what.

Ans. First, here is leaping from the Commandements to the Sacraments, which is out of order: secondly, I returne his argument vpon him selfe. To their seruice and in the administration of the *Lords supper*, the Ministers intencion is required: for if he intend to serue the Diuell, and by giuing them the communion to bind them the faster to him; then doe they (in saying *Amen* to his praiers, & receiuing the communion at his handes) joyne with him in the Diuels seruice. Nowe they haue no more certainty of their Ministers meaning, then we haue of our Priests intencion: yea much lesse of many of them, who are mad-merry fellowes, and care not greatly whereabout they goe, nor what they intend: must they therefore flie from their diuine seruice and holy communion, because they be not certaine of their Ministers intencion therein? Surely they should, if his reason were ought worth. But in such cases we must perswade our selues that Gods Ministers doe their dutie, vlesse we see great cause to the contrary; and thereupon are we bold to doe our dutie to the blessed Sacrament: If he should faile in his, yet our intencion being pure to adore Christes holy body only, and nothing else there, we should formally be the true worshippers of Christ, though materially we were mistaken in that Host; which to rearme Idolatry, is to stile our Sauour I E S V S Christ an Idoll, and therefore blasphemy in the highest degree.

His third objection is out of the fourth Commandement, which (as he saith) giveth a liberty to worke six daies in the ordinary affaires of our calling, which liberty (saith he) cannot be repealed by any creature: the Church of Rome therefore erreth, in that it prescribeth other set and ordinary festiual daies, to be obserued as straighly, and with as much solemnity as the Sabbath of the Lord.

Ans. Doth not the Church of England also prescribe the Natiuity of our

our Saviour, and of S. Iohn Baptist, the feastes of the Apostles, and many others to be kept holy, and command that no man worke in the affaires of their calling those daies? doth their owne Church also erre therein? How say you then to the Church of the Israelites, which kept the feastes of Easter, Whitsontide, and of the Tabernacles, as straightly and with as much solemnity, as they kept the Lordes Sabbath: was it also mis-led to the breach of Gods Commandements? or must we not rather thereby learne, that six daies in the weeke, were at the first left vs free to labour in; but yet so, that by the decree and commandement of our spirituall Gouvernours, any of them might (vpon just occasion) be made festiuall, and thereupon euery good Christian bound to keepe them, by their obedience vnto their Gouvernours? to thinke the contrary is a high point of Puritanisme.

Fourthly (saith M. P. E. R.) the first Commandement enioyneth children to obey father and mother in all things, specially in matters of moment; as in their Marriages and choice of their calling, and that euen to death: and yet the Church of Rome against the intent of this Commandement, alloweth that clandestine Marriages and the vowe of religion shall be in force, though they be without and against the consent of wise and carefull parents.

Ans. It is very false to say that children must obey their parents in all things: for if parents command them any thing either against Gods lawe or the Princes, they must not obey them therein. And touching clandestine and priuie Marriages, they are of force aswell in the Church of England, as in the Church of Rome: yea more too. For by the Church of Rome alwaies they haue bene forbidden very seuerely; and since the Councell of Trent, are made void and of no force, where the Councell can be published. Concerning entring into religion, childrens vowes (during their minority) may be annulled and made of no force by their parents: marry, when they come to riper daies, if their father stand not in necessity of their help, they may forsake him to followe Christ in a more perfect kind of life: as S. Iames & S. Iohn forsoke their father Zebedee, & followed Christ. Math. 4.

Fiftly, The last Commandement (saith M. P. E. R.) forbiddeth the first motions vers. 22. to sinne, that are before consent. He proueth it thus: Lust with consent is forbidden in the former Commandements: thou shalt not commit adultery, and thou shalt not steale: therefore if the last forbid no more, it is confounded with the former. Again, the Philosophers knew that lust with consent was euil, euen by the light of nature; but Paul a learned Pharisee, knew not lust to be sinne, that is forbid in the Commandement. Lust therefore that is forbidden here, is without consent. Wicked Rom. 7. then is the doctrine of Rome, that requireth our consent to euery most all sinne.

Ans. Their doctrine is most reasonable and godly: For the first motions to sinne, are rather the actions of the euill spirit, tempting vs to euill; then.

then of a man, in whose minde they are before he is aware of them; and who alsoone as he beginneth to marke them, disliketh them and chafeth them thence: and howe can he carry a right opinion of the mild goodnes of God, that thinketh him so hastie with his fraile creature man, as to punish him eternally for such a thought, as is thrust into his minde at vnawares, and may come vpon him in his sleepe, went he neuer so well disposed to bed? Se more of this in the question of originall sinne. To his reasons for the contrary I answere to the first, that lust with consent is not expressly forbid in the former commandements, but the act of adultery and stealing: yet, it might well haue beene reduced vnto them, as it is in the other commandements. Neuerthelesse, because our frailty is more prone to the wicked lust of concupiscence, and desire of our neighbours goodes, it pleased God for the better bridling of them, to giue vs particuler preceptes against them; specially considering, that it was also very hard, by the dimine light of our darkened reason, to discern them to be such capitall finnes. And whereas he saith, that the Philosophers knewe the inward consent of our mind, without any exteriour actes to be mortall sinne: I take him to speake at randome, and more then he can proue. Sure it is, that many learned *Iewes*, who should knowe more then Philosophers,

Cap. 5. 28. knewe not so much: as may be gathered out of *S. Mathewe*, and out of *Iosephus lib. 12. Antig. cap. 13.* and *Dauid Kimby* vpon the 66. Psalme vers. 17. & 29.

Rom. ca. 7. And *S. Paules* owne confession rightly vnderstood witnesse the same: vers. 7. For (saith he) *I had not knowne concupiscence to haue beene sinne, vntil I sawe the lawe had taught it to be sinne.* Wherefore it was very expedient, after the inhibition of the actes of adultery and theft, to forbid in plaine and expresse termes, the lustes and desires of them.

Lastly (saith M. PER.) the wordes of the second Commandment (and shewe mercy vnto thousandes on them that loue me, and keepe my Commandements) ouerthroweth all humane merits. For if the reward be giuen of mercy to them that keepe the lawe, it is not giuen for the merit of the worke done.

Ans. Either simple was this mans iudgement sometimes, or else most peruersly bent to deceiue the simple. For God speaketh there, neither of the reward that is rendred in heauen for good workes, neither of any reward at all, that is rendred vnto the person himselfe that keepeth Gods commandements; but of a superabundant fauour, that God of his bounty will shewe vnto thousandes of others, for one mans sake that loueth him and keepeth his commandements: therefore very peuisly doth he drawe hence any thing against merits.

And to beginne here where M. PER. leaueth, to shewe howe their newe doctrine and inuentions, doth crosse and make void the commandements

of God. First in that, that he promisetb mercy and fauour vnto thousandes for ones sake, that keepeth his Commandements, we gather: that God in regard of his Saints (who so holily obserued his Commandements) doth graunt vnto vs many fauours and graces: also, that the satisfaction of one may serue for another; for else God would not punish children vnto the third and fourth generation, for the offence of their great grand-father, vntill their punishment serued to satisfie for their ancestors offence: hence also we gather, that some men doe keepe Gods Commandements, otherwise God did in vaine promise to fauour thousandes for their sakes that kept the Commandements, if he knewe well that there should be none such. Therefore most vngodly is that position of the Protestantes, that it is impossible to keepe the Commandements: and which alone ouerthroweth all the tenne Commandements. For as all men skilfull in the true nature of lawes doe hold: there can be no just lawe, that is impossible to be kept, by the greater part of them to whom the lawe is giuen; because lawes are both to direct our actions, and doe also bind every man to obserue them. Nowe what reasonable lawe-maker will beate his braine to direct a man to doe that, which he knoweth before hand, not to lie in the mans power to doe? and as tyrannical should he be esteemed, that would bind a man vnder a great penalty, to doe that which he knewe to be impossible for him to doe. Which two points S. Augustine doth in one sentence confirme, saying; *Who doth not crie out that De fid. cōt. it is folly to giue him Commandements, in whose power it is not to performe them? Manich. and who doth not say that it is vnjust, to condemne him for not doing just things, cap. 9. when he could not doe them?* The Protestantes therefore affirming the Commandements not to be possible to be performed, doe make them no lawes at all; and so they at one blow, doe beare downe al the tenne Commandements. But let vs come to the particulars.

1. The first Commandement, as it forbiddeth vs to worship false Gods: so doth it also include a commandement to worshippinge a right the only true God, which is done principally by Faith, Hope, Charity and Religion. The Protestantes by their peruerting of many articles of our beleife (as hath bin shewed) haue lost the true faith, and by their newe certainty of faith, leaue no place for hope: for they are past hope of saluation, that make themselves so assured of it as they doe. And as for charity which S. Iohn defineth 1. Epist. 5. to be the keeping of Gods Commandements, they must needs confesse themselves to be farre from it, which hold that to be impossible: and with the principall part of true religion (which consisteth in offering a true, reall, and externall sacrifice vnto God, as in that question hath beene proued) they are at vtter defiance.

2. Touching the second Commandement after our account; as God is ho-

noured by swearing in justice, judgement, and truth: so is he also by vowes made vnto him of Godly and religious duties, which the Prophet *David* *Psal. 75.* significeth, when he saith: *vowe ye, and render your vowes vnto the Lord your* *vers. 13.* *God.* Here vpon many *Catholikes* haue, and doe continually vowe perpetuall *pouerty, chastity, and obedience*, the more fully and freely to serue God; which holy vowes the *Protestantes* disallowe wholly: neither doe they allowe of any other vowes, for ought I haue heard: they doe therefore diminish the seruice of God, and pare away a part of that which is reduced to the second Commandement.

3. And whereas in the third we are commanded to keepe holy the *Sabbath* day, which is principally performed by hearing (attentiuely and deuoutly) that diuine seruice, which was instituted by Christ, and defined by his Apostles, which is the *holy Masse*: they may not abide it, but serue God after the inuention of their owne braines, with a mingle-mangle of some old, some newe, odly patched together.

4. In the fourth we are commanded to obey our Princes, as well as our parents, and all other our Governours in all lawfull matters: yet the *Protestantes* hold, that our Princes lawes doe not bind vs in conscience.

5. The fift Commandement, teacheth that no man be killed by priuate authority: yet *Protestantes* hold it lawfull to take armes, euen against their lawfull Princes for the aduancement of their Gospell, and haue in that quarrell killed, and caused to be killed, millions in *Germany, France, Flanders, and Scotland.*

6. The sixth forbiddeth adultery, which is allowed of by *Protestants* in some case. For they permit one party after diuorcement to marry againe, the other yet liuing; whereas our Sauour saith: *Whoſoener diſmiſſeth his wiſe* *Mar. 10.* *and marrieth another committeth adultery vpon her. And if the wiſe diſmiſſe her* *vers. 11.* *husband and marry another, ſhe committeth adultery.* Moreover, incest is also forbidden in this Commandement; nowe by the *Canons* of the *Catholicke Church*, and the authority of the ancient Fathers, it is incest for one Cosen germane to marry with another: yet is it not seldome practised; yea, it is generally allowed of in the Church of *England.*

7. The seauenth Commandement, condemneth with theft, vsury, & al withholding of our neighbours goodes, which was gotten vnlawfully: yet *Protestantes* commonly make no conscience to take tenne in the hundred, which is plaine vsury; and as for restitution of euill gotten goodes, it is cleane out of fashion among them.

8. The eight prohibiteth vs to beare false witness against our neighbour: and yet doe *Ministers* (the master *Protestants*) in their pulpit (where truth should only be taught), most commonly beare such false witness against *Catholikes,*

Catholikes, that the very Stones may be astonished at their most impudent slanders, to wiser that *Papists* beleue in stockes and stones: that they will not be saued by Christ and his passion; but by their owne workes: that they robbe God of his honour, and giue it to Saintes; and a hundreth such likemost notorious and palpable lies. Wherefore as they Preachers be guilty of bearing false witnesse: so the auditors deserue to be seduced by them, who hearing them to lie so shamelesly in somethinges, will neuertheless beleue them in others.

9. and 10. *Of the ninth and tenth.* I haue spoken already; wherein they erre grievously, in teaching every man to sinne damnably, by hauing any euill motion cast into his minde by the Diuell, albeit he resisteth it presently, and forthwith chase it away. In which conflict & ouercomming of temptation, the grace and power of God is perfit as *S. Paul* witnesleth: and *S. James* calleth the allurements of concupiscence temptation only; and then first sinne when it conceiueth (that is) getteth some liking of the parry.

Nowe to conclude this passage, if you please to heare to what height of perfect obseruance of the Commandements, the Euangelicall preachers haue brought their followers in *Germany* vnto, by teaching the Comandements to be impossible; and that only faith iustificth, & that good workes haue no reward in heauen, and such like; *Iacobus Andreas* a famous *Lutheran* shall enforme you, who writeth thus. *That the whole world may see these men De Placati* alienated from the Papacy, and to put no confidence in workes; therefore they doe netis. no good worke at all. Instead of fasting; they feast and are drunken day and night: in lieu of Almes, they oppresse & pil the poore: they haue changed praying into cursing & blaspheming the name of God so prophanely; that no *Turkes* nor *Saracens* commit the like impiety against Christ: for humility, there raigneth pride, disdain, cruelty, and riotte in apparell, &c. and much more to the same purpose. And that this truth may be confirmed by the testimony of two sound witnesses; *Muscus* a man of no small account among them, thus reporteth of his Bretheren in the Lord. Such now is the condition of the *Lutherans*, *De pra-* that if any man list to behold a great number of *Knaues*, robbers, malicious persons, pbeia coseners, vsurers, and such like deceiuers, let him but enter into a City where the *Christi*. *Gospell* is taught, and there he shall find good store of them: and a litle after. Surely it is true, that among *Heathens*, *Iewes*, *Turkes*, and other *Infidels*, none can be found more vntruly, and that lesse esteeme of honestie and vertue, then the *Euangelicall* Bretheren; with whom all thinges passe currant, and no thing almost is blamed (except vertue:) For the Diuell hath shaken of all their bandes, and turned them loose. Hauiug done with the Creede and tenne Comandements, we must now come to our Lordes praier.

Master *P. R.* beginneth with it thus. The Lordes praier is a most absolute

forme of prayer: nor we in this we are taught to direct our prayers to God alone. Our father, &c. and that only in the name and mediation of Christ; for God is our father only by Christ: therefore to vse any mediation of Saints is needlesse.

Ans. We allowe our Lordes praier to be a most perfect forme of praier: yet hold that many other sort of praiers may be made vnto God very acceptably, as sundry other praiers vsed by Christ & set downe in the Gospell doe teach vs: and therefore to argue that because one praier of Christs making is directed to God, that no other may be made to any Saint, is very childish. We gather praier to Saints our of S. Pauls requesting the Romans and Corinthians, and others to pray for him: and out of the mediation of the woman of Cananea to Christ for her daughter: and the Disciples speaking to Christ for her, with such like: both out of the old and newe Testament. For if it had beene either needlesse or bootlesse, to haue praied vnto God any otherwise, then in the name and by the mediation of Christ; then S. Paul would not haue requested the helpe of mortall mens praiers to God for him: and if poore sinners praiers may helpe vs, much more may the intercession of the glorious Saints doe, who are in farre greater fauour with God: See the question of intercession of Saints. Again; if that only forme of praier were to be vsed, neither were it lawfull to pray to Christ himselfe; neither could it be proved thereby, that we should pray in Christes name. For there is no expresse mention of Christes name; neither any petition for Christes sake. For God may be truly called our father, in that he immediately createth and giueth vs our soules, which is more then our bodies, that we receiue from our carnall fathers.

Secondly, he hoppeth to the fourth petition. *Giue vs our daylie bread:* in which wordes we acknowledge (saith he) that euery morsel of bread is the meere gift of God: what madnesse then is it for vs to thinke that we should merit the kingdom of heauen: that cannot merit so much as bread? It is false that we cannot merit our bread: For Christ teacheth, that he who goeth to preach the Gospell, is worthy of, that is: meriteth and deserueth his meate; which S. Paul testifieth, saying: that our Lord ordained, that those who preach the Gospell should liue of the Gospell. And doe not day labourers deserue their bread, before they eate it? and others that buy their bread, doe I hope deserue it. What ignorance then is it, in the very principles of our faith, to auouch that we cannot merit bread: which notwithstanding we pray God to giue vs; because, neither could we deserue and yerne it, without his helpe and assistance; neither would it doe vs any good without his blessing.

Thirdly, in the next petition: *Forgiue vs our debtes;* fower opinions of the Roman religion (saith he) are directly aueribrowne. What fower at one blowe!

blowe 1 what a Hercules haue we here: let vs heare which. The first is humane satisfaction: for the child of God is taught here to pray for the pardon of his sinnes; nowe to pray for pardon and to make satisfaction be contrary.

Ans^r. This is a sillie ouerthrowe: for it is so farre of, that praier and satisfaction are contraries, that praier it selfe is one of the three workes of satisfaction: Fasting, Praying, and giuing of Almesse are not contrary, but the very workes of satisfaction. And our Lordes praier is esteemed by S. *Lib. 1. de* *Augustine* (who is assoone to be belêued as M. PERKINS) sufficient of it *Simbolo.* selfe, to satisfie for the light daylie offences that iust men fall into: besides *cap. 6. in* Christ himselfe praied for pardon of these mortall sinnes, for which not- *Enchir.* withstanding Gods justice was fully satisfied by Christ his sufferings; *cap. 69.* wherefore satisfaction and to sue for pardon, are not so contrary, but they may well stand together.

Nowe to the second downefall: merits are here also ouerthrowne. For we acknowledge our selues debtors, and we daylie increase our debts: nowe it is madnesse to thinke that they, who daylie increase their debts, can deserue or purchase any good of the creditors, in a word, this must be thought vpon, &c.

And good reason too. First then I answer, that venial sinnes and smal debts that iust men daylie incurre, doe not hinder the daylie merit of their other good workes. As a seruant hired by the day, by committing some small fault, doth not thereby loose his daies wages: againe, though he should commit such a fault, that might make him vnworthy of his daies hire, yet, if his Master did forgiue him that fault, his wages were notwithstanding due to him: and so the asking pardon for our sinnes doth not ouerthrowe, but rather establish and fortifie our merits.

The third opinion imagined to be confuted by this petition, is: that temporall punishment may be retained after the crime it selfe, and the eternall is remitted: but this cannot stand (saith he.) For we owe to God obedience, and for the defect of this paiement, we owe to God the forfeiture of punishment. Sinne then is called our debt, in respect of the punishment: And therefore when we pray for pardon of our sinnes, we require not only the fault to be pardoned, but the whole punishment; and when debt is pardoned, it is absurd to thinke that the least paiement should remaine.

Ans^r. Here is a most absurd collection: For when we in our Lordes praier craue pardon of our debts, we confesse that we are in his debt, and that there is paiement of punishment yet due vnto vs, the remission whereof we then require: nowe this praier is made by the best men after their conuersion (as he confesseth) who standing in Gods fauour, and therefore free from eternall punishment, doe notwithstanding craue pardon and release of some punishment, by M. PERKINS owne interpretation:

Whereupon it followeth most evidently out of this petition, that after eternall punishment is forgiven vnto the just, there is some other punishment remaining, of which they craue pardon; and consequently this opinion of ours is (by this very petition and M. PER. owne explication of it) much strengthened and confirmed, and nothing at all weakened.

The fourth point of our doctrine hence impugned by M. PER. is: *that a man in this life may fulfill the lawe.* Whereas in this place every seruants of God is taught to aske daylie pardon for the breach of the lawe: answer is made, that our daylie sinnes are veniall, and not against the lawe, though besides the lawe: but this which they say, is against this petition: for a debt that commeth by forfeiture, is against the band or obligation. Nowe every sinne is a debt causing the forfeiture of punishment, and therefore is not beside, but against the lawe.

Ans. I graunt that every sinne is a debt, causing the forfeiture of punishment; but this punishment may be small & short, and so the sinne veniall, & the debt not against the lawe directly, yet against the band of some morall duty: as the mispending of time, vying of some idle wordes, and the committing of such like light faults, which I am bound in reason to auoid; but not by any prescript lawe directly. And thus in fine we see, how fouly M. PER. was mistaken, that thought to overthrow fower points of our doctrine at a clap, when not so much as one is thereby any whit at all stirred.

He saith further, *In this clause (as we forgieue our debtors) it is taken for granted, that we may certainly knowe that we repent and beleue, and are reconciled by God; which all Roman Catholikes denie.*

Ans. Nothing lesse, because much more is required to the one, then to the other. For it is farre easier to discern, whether I doe yet beare any euill will to my neighbour, then to knowe assuredly, that I doe hartily repent me of almy sinnes, and that for the loue of God; and further that I haue a firme purpose not to commit hereafter, any kind of mortall sinne: these thinges (as every one may plainly see) are farre more difficult, then the other of forgiuing them that trespass against vs.

In the last wordes: and lead vs not into temptation, we pray not (saith he)
Psal. 26. *that God should free vs from temptation, for it is other whiles good to be tempted:*
vers. 1. *but that we be not left vnto the malice of Satan, and held captiue of the temptation:*
for here to be led into temptation; and to be deliuered, are opposed. Nowe hence I gather, that he who is the child of God truly justified and sanctified, shall neuer fall wholly and finally from the grace of God; and I conclude on this manner. That which we aske according to the will of God, shall be graunted: but this the child of God asketh, that he might neuer be wholly forsaken of his father, and led captiue into temptation: this therefore shall be graunted.

Ans. If this argument were sound, neuer should any Christian that
 faith

saith our Lordes praier, fall finally and be damned; because they all make this petition, and that according to the will of God, who would haue all men *1. Tim. 2. 3.* *saued.* Many things then besides saying our Lordes praier, are required to *vers. 4.* saluation, for want of which many that haue often said that praier fall finally. Againe, he mistaketh the true sence of that petition: for therein we doe not aske that we continue nor in sinne, which we asked in the former petition (*forgiue vs our sinnes*) but we pray that we be not overcome by the Deuill, by yeelding our consent to the temptation, and so fall into sinne. Lastly, he forgetteth himselfe much when he saith, *that it is good to be tempted:* for he holdeth for certaine, that the very first motions to sinne in vs (which is the beginning of the temptation) are mortall sinnes; and so by himselfe, it is good to fall into mortall sinne, if it be good we should be tempted.

Finally (he saith) this clause (Amen) signifieth a speciall faith concerning all the former petitions, that they shall be graunted, and therefore a speciall faith concerning remission of sinnes.

Answ. It signifieth a speciall hope and confidence to obtaine them, but no certaintie of faith, vnlesse vpon a condition which is vncertaine: that is, if we doe our partes, God will not faile of his; if we doe hartily repent vs, and vse the Sacrament of Penance duly, we shall assuredly obtaine remission of our sinnes. Hitherto M. P. E. hath argued against vs out of the Lordes praier: nowe I will briefly shewe howe the Protestantes doctrine contrarieth it.

I haue in my answere to his objections, touched some points already: I adde, that one position of their doctrine crosseth three of the first petitions. I proue it thus: In every petition we must be assured (as M. P. E. holdeth) or at the least haue a good hope to obtaine that we pray for, or else it booteth vs not to pray: but according to the Protestantes doctrine no man can be assured, nay can haue any hope to obtaine the three first petitions: for if originall sinne doe continually dwell in vs, and infect all our actions with deadly sinne as they teach; Gods name cannot be sanctified in vs, that are infected with such an vncleane leprosie: neither secondly, can God raigne as a King in vs, if sinne possesse & command all our members: and thirdly, Gods wil cannot be done by vs on earth as it is done in beauen, if we cannot keepe his lawes and commandements, which they in heauen doe: wherefore the Protestantes haue no assurance to obtaine the three first petitions, who are by their teachers assured, that they are not to be expected or hoped for: nor they cannot (according to their owne rules) from their hart make the said petitions, being out of all hope to obtaine them.

In the fourth, we aske aswell to be made partakers of Christes blessed body

body in the Sacrament, which is the food of our soules: as for our daylie corporal sustenance. For so doe the ancient Fathers expound that petition: as namely *S. Ciprian* in oratione Dominica: *S. Hierome* in 6. Mathias *S. Ambrose* li. 5. de Sacrament. c. 4. where he hath these memorable wordes of the blessed Sacrament: *that before the wordes of Christ it was bread, but after it is the body of Christ. Why then* (saith he) *is it called here bread?* he answereth, *that it is called bread not simply, but supersubstantiall bread.* For so doth the grecke word *Epiousson* signifie, as well as daylie: *it is* (saith he) *not such bread as passeth into our body, but it is the bread of eternal life that vpholdeth the substance of our soules.* Nowe you may be well assured, that Protestantes who will not beleue any such bodily presence, doe not pray to God to giue it them.

And touching *forgiuenesse* of their debts to God, and sinnes; they are so assured of that before hand, by the certaintie of their new faith, that they can no more request of God *forgiuenesse* of their sinnes, then they can aske, that God will make them reasonable creatures, which they see that he hath done already. And they holding the first motions to euil in temptation, to be mortall sinnes, which no mortall man ordinarily can now e-void; howe can they pray God *not to suffer them to be lead into temptation*, when they teach it to be impossible to escape the venime of it? And if they vnderstand it so, as *M. PERKINS* teacheth: to wit, *that they there pray, not to be left to the malice of Satan, they cannot without losse of the certaintie of their faith pray so*; because they hold themselves assured of that before hand.

Neither can they pray God generally *to deliuer them from all euill*, affirming as they doe, that we must needes fall into mortall sinne at euery step almost, which is the greatest of all other euill. And finally; if it belong to God *to deliuer vs from sinne*, and all other euill; then *Caluin* and his followers doe wickedly blasphemee, who teach God to be the authour and worker in vs, of all error, sinne, and wickednes. Thus much of the *Paternoster*.

Nowe before I come to the Sacraments, I may not omit to speake a word of the *Aue Maria*, which in old *Catechismes* followeth immediately after the *Paternoster*. The Protestantes haue cassied it, and may not abide to heare it once said; but therein, as much as in any other such matter, they disgrace their doctrine and discredit themselves. For all the wordes vsed of old therein, are the very wordes of the holy Ghost, registred in *S. Lukes* Gospell; and therefore they bewray either great ignorance, or a wicked spirit to dwell in them, that cannot indure to heare the wordes of Gods spirit. Besides, in holy Scripture it is prophesied, that *from henceforth all generations should call the Virgin MARY blessed*. In what tearmes then can we more conueniently so cal her, then in the very same that were composed

composed by an *archangel*: are penned by the Euangelists, and by them commended vnto all good Christians: besides, the sence of them is comfortable vnto vs, as containing a remembrance of the incarnation of the Sonne of God for our redemption, and we on our partes doe thereby giue thanks to God for that inestimable benefit; and congratulate our Sauiour with humble thanks therefore, saying, *a Blessed be alle fruits of thy wombe*. As yall I need not in such cleare euidence of Gods word, allage the testimony of any ancient Father: he that list to see howe it hath bene vsed in the purest antiquity, let him read S. Athanasius in *euang.*, de *deipara* S. Ephrem de *laudibus B. Mariae*, S. Basil and S. Chrysostomes *liturgies*; which can with no more reason be denied to be theirs, then the rest of their works. On this sentence I will set downe in commendations of it, out of that most reuerend and deuout Bernard. The Angels triumph, and the heavens doe congratulate vvith them, the earth leapeth for joy, and nise. Co- bellers beleeue when the *Aue Maria* is devoutly said. Good Christians *vintib.* 1. then must needs take great delight in it, even as the badde may not. In E- bide *vintib.* 1. build rebred lurt north to haue long *vintib.* 1. bidon murther *uang. cap.*

Now let us come to the last part of the *Catechisme*, which is of the Sacraments, where M. PERKINS doth briefly repeat his arguments, used before against the real presence: I might therefore, send the reader unto the first Chapter of this booke for the answer; but because the matter is of great importance, I will here againe give them a short answer. *First* (saith he) *the real presence is asserted by none of these words, he tooke bread and waile in: ege, that which Christ tooke, was not his body.* Seco

A simple ouerthrowe, Christ (in deed) tooke and brake bread, but presently after blessing it, made it his body by these vvordes, *this is my body*...

Againe: Christ said not vnder the forme of bread, or in bread, but this, that is: M. Per. 2.

Ans. It is false to say that this word (*Hoc, This*) doth demonstrate bread: for it is of a different gender from it, both in *Latin* and *Greek*; and if he had said, that that bread had bene his body, his word was so omnipotent, that it had bene of force to make it his body, so that M. PER. maketh a false construction, which nothing helpeth his errour.

Thirdly, Bread was not given for vs. but only the body of Christ; and in the first institution, the body of Christ was not then really given to death.

on *Answ.* This maketh nothing at all against the reall presence, but doth greatly fortifie it: For Christ gaue vs in the Sacrament, that which should be put to death for vs, *this is my body that shal be giuen for you.* Nowe not bread, but Christes true body was giuen to death for vs *ergo,* Christ gaue vs to eate not bread, but his true reall body. *I haue eaten of his body* &c.

Per. 4. Fourthly, The cuppe is the new Testament by a figure, why not then the bread the body of Christ by a figure? Answer. A goodly reason, if there be one figure there must needs be two. How followeth this? if those wordes of S. Paul be obscure, why did he not rather cleare them by conferring them with S. Matthew, and S. Marke, who deliver it plainly thus: *this is my blood of the new Testament that shall be shedde*; &c. But he that delighteth in mauling, and looke darkenesse, would not so fitly and surely instruct us as to vouchsafe us

Per. 5. Firstly, Christ did eate that supper, but not himselfe: as though it were his body. Answer. A Protestant cannot say that Christ did eate of that Sacrament, as the Papists doth; because he hath no warrant for it in the written word, yet he dooeth manerly what he did to, and note himselfe worthy to taste of that heavenly food.

Per. 6. Sixtly, We are bid to doe it till he come: Christ then is not bodily present. Answer. We are bid by S. Paul to shew the death of our Lord till he come in judgement, at which we may very well doe, his body being present in certain noble Matrons preferred of their husbands blood, to represent more freshly into their children, the slaughter of their fathers.

Per. 7. Seventhly, Christ did not die in remembrance of himselfe, but for us: his remembrance are of things absent. Answer. We see one thing and remember another. By Christes body really present, we remember the same to have beene nailed on the crosse for our redemption: as Golias sword was kept in the tabernacle, and remembrance of the cutting off of Golias head with the same sword; and the women before rehearsed kept their husbands blood, and might much easier have preserved their bodies embalmed, to keepe the blood their deatnes in fresh memory.

Per. 8. Eightly, If the real presence be graunted, then the body and blood of Christ are either severed or joynted together; if severed, then Christ is sacrificed; if joynted together, then the bread is both the body and blood of Christ; whereas the institution saith, the bread is the body, and the wine is the blood, but not both. Answer. The body & blood of Christ are by force of Christs wordes consecrated a part to share if they could be naturally separated, they should be also severed in the Sacrament, as they might have beene at Christs death, when all the blood was poured forth of his body; but ever since Christs resurrection, they are joynted together; that they can be no more severed: so that we graunt under one kinde of the Sacrament to be both Christes body and blood, which is not wrought by the wordes of the institution, but by the necessary and inseparable conjunction of Christes body with his blood, ever since his glorious resurrection.

Finally,

Finally, **M. PERKINS** condemneth the administration of the Sacrament vnder one only kinde: for the commandement of Christ is, *drinke ye al of this*, *Math. 26. vers. 27.* and this commandement is yebearfed to the Church of Corinth in these wordes: *doe this as oft as ye drinke it, in remembrance of me. ver. 25.* and no power can reuerse this commandement, because it was established by the soveraigne head of the Church.

Dissonant. He beganne to set downe the institution of the Sacrament out of *S. Paul*, *1. Cor. 11.* here he leapeth backe to *S. Mathew*, because he fetcheth him better in this point: to vvhome I answered, that Christ there spake only vnto his twelue Apostles, vvhoe were afterwarde to administer that holy Sacrament to others; and so something there-about is spoken to them, vvhich may not be extended vnto lay-men, but vnto Priests only, who were to succede the Apostles in that ministry. All men doe confesse these wordes: *this facite, doe ye this*; that is, administer ye this Sacrament, to be spoken only to the Apostles, and in them to all of the Clergie alone: euen so, *drinke ye al of this*, was in like manner spoken vnto them only as Clergie-men; and therefore it is a commandement only to Priests so to doe: and as for others, they may either drinke of it, or not drinke of it, as it shall be thought most expedient by their supreme Pastors; and this may be gathered out of those very wordes, *drinke ye al of this*. For why should the Apostles haue a speciall charge more to drinke of that cuppe, then to eate of that foode? vnles it were to signifie, that where as all men should be bound to receiue Christes body: they should be further bound to receiue that holy cuppe also; from which bond other men should stand free. But to come to the purpose, when they quarrell wih vs for taking away from the people one kinde of the Sacrament: we answered, that we doe them no hinderance thereby; because we giue them both the blessed body & sacred bloud of Christ together vnder one kinde: yea, whole Christ, both God and man; because they be so iynited that they cannot be separated. But what can they answer, when we complaine vpon them, for that they haue defrauded the poore people, of both body and bloud of Christ; and in lieu of that most precious banquet, doe giue them a cold breake-fast, of a morsel of bread & a suppe of wine: this is a most miserable & lamentable exchange: in deede; our blessed Lord giue them grace to see it, & deliuer them speedily from it. Here is the place to shew, how the Protestants doe not only becaue their vnfortunate followers of this most heavenly foode of Christes body: but that they also deprive them of the manifold & great graces of God, deriued vnto vs in o. other sacraments: but because I haue touched it in the Preface, I wil omit it here, and make an end with **M. PER.** as soone as I haue requited him, by propounding briefly

some arguments for the real presence, as he hath done against it. Let this be the first:

1. The state of the new Testament, which is more perfect then the old, requireth accordingly Sacraments of greater grace and perfection then the old had: they had *Manna*, which for substance and taste farre passed our bread, and in signification was equall to it: Wherefore, either we must graunt our Sacrament of bread and wine, to be inferiour to theirs of the old Testament; or else acknowledge and confesse it to be the true body and blood of Christ, which doth surpasse theirs exceedingly, as the body doth the shadowe. This argument is confirmed by our Saviour himselfe, who
Iohn. 6. in expresse tearmes doth preferre the meate, that he was to give to his Disciples, before that of *Manna*, which their Fathers had eaten in the wilderness.
vs. 48. 49.
2. Secondly, Christ promised to give to his Disciples his flesh to eat, and his blood to drinke: and when they marveiled howe that could be, he assured them, that vnlesse they did eat his flesh, they should not haue life in them, and further certified them, that his flesh was truly meate, and his blood truly drinke: vvhence it is most plainly deduced, that he who neuer faileth of his promise, gaue them his true flesh to eat, and his true blood to drinke.
Ibid. vs. 55
3. Thirdly, Christ said in most cleare tearmes: *this is my body: this is my blood.* What could be more certaine or more perspicuous?
4. Fourthly, These vvordes of the institution are recorded by three Euangelists, and by *S. Paul*: and they all vniformely deliver it to be not the figure of Christs body, but his body; and that his body which should be giuen for our redemption on the crosse: ergo, it was that his true reall body, vvhich was nailed to the crosse for vs.
5. Fifthly, *S. Paul* demandeth thus: the Chalice of benediction, which we doe
1. Cor. 10. blesse, is it not the communication of the blood of Christ? and the bread that we
vers. 16. breake, is it not the participation of the body of our Lord? if then we doe in receiuing the blessed Sacrament participate Chrites body, and communicate his blood, they surely are there really present.
6. Again, *S. Paul* saith: He that eateth and drinketh unworthely, eateth and
1. Cor. 11. drinketh judgement to himselfe, not discerning the body of our Lord: and before
vers. 28. is guilty of the body and blood of Christ: ergo, the body and blood of Christ are there present; or else why should a man incurre that guilt; but by his unworthy receiuing of it, and by not discerning Chrites body to be there present?
7. Besides all these plainetextes of holy Scripture in confirmation of the reall presence, the very circumstances of it doe much fortifie our faith therein. In *S. Luke* we haue, that our Saviour marueilously desired
Luce. 22. to eat that this last banquet vvhith his Disciples
vers. 15. (desiderio desideranti) to eat that this last banquet vvhith his Disciples.

S. Iohn addeth: *that what as he loved his that were in the world, was the end he loved them: and knowing that the Father gave al things unto his handes, and that he came from God, and goeth to God.* &c. What comendation (I say) with this exceeding loue and infinit power of Christ, to be shewed in his last supper, if he hath left only bread and wine to be taken in remembrance of him? any meane man might easily haue done as much: and Helias departing from his Disciple *Elisens*, did much more for himself a more noble remembrance of himselfe behind him, to wit: *his staffe and double spirit.* But Christ bequeathing vs his true natural body to be the food of our soules, and comfort of our hartes as we beleeue & teach, he then (in deede) shewed his infinit power and loue towards vs, and *that he came from God,* and as God bestowed an inestimable gift vpon vs, such a one as neuer any other did, or could possibly doe.

Moreover, the institution of a religious rite and ceremony, to be vsed in the whole Church vnto the worldes end, and to be receiued of all Christian people of age and discretion, did necessarily require that it should be done in most certaine and cleare termes; otherwise, there might arise great strife and contention about it, and be the ruine of thousandes. And specially great perspicuity is required in this holy Sacrament, where the mistaking of it, must needs breede either Idolatry, if we vvorshippe for Christ, that which is not Christ: or impiety, if on the other side we should not giue to it (being Christ God and man) diuine honour. Wherefore, no good Christian may thinke, but that our prouident Sauour Christ Iesus vs, vvho very vvell foresawe all these inconueniences, did deliuer it in such termes as he would haue to be taken properly, and not be construed at mens pleasures figuratiuely. Adde, that he spake those wordes to the twelue Apostles only, vvhome he vvvas accustomed to instruct plainely, and not in parable darkely; and who were wont also to aske for the interpretation of obscure speeches, vvho here made no question about this high mistery, because they were sufficiently forewarned, *that they should eate Christes flesh, and that his body was truly meate:* and therefore beleeued Christes wordes without further question.

Finally, this holy Sacrament is a principall part of the newe Testament, and one of the chiefeest legacies by Christ bequeathed vnto vs Christians. Nowe what lawe or conscience will permit, that any legacy should be interpreted figuratiuely? to vvit: that for a house, goodes, or landes bequeathed and giuen by last vvill and testament; you should vnderstand a figure of a house to be giuen, or the signification and representation of some goodes or landes. If this be most absurd and ridiculous in the testament of any ordinary man, about temporall goodes: howe much more

pernicious and intolerable is it, to suffer this in the eternall Testament of the Sonne of God, and that in his divine and inestimable treasures. And thus at length by the grace of God I come to the end of this booke, wherein (good Christian reader) if thou finde any thing, that may confirme thee in the true Catholike faith, draw it further thy knowledge therein; give God the Honour of lightes, from whence all good gifts descend, the whole praise. If any thing be amisse; impute it partly to my slender skill, oversight, or negligence; and partly to the want of a convenient resting-place, commodity of bookes, and conference, all which these times of persecution doe deprive.

Secondly, Christ hath promised us, that if we shall be persecuted for his name, we shall be blessed. To the most blessed and holy Trinity be all honour and glory both now and for ever.

AMEN

FINIS.



